Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XII., No. 2. MAY, 1922.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Anglican Communion.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:—	
Modern Churchmen and Convocation	57
The Growth of a Myth	63
The Headship of Christ	65
Fact and Mode in Biology and in Theology J. C. Hardwick, M.A.	69
China and Modernism F. E. A. Shepherd, M.A.	77
The Appeal to History E. J. Martin, B.D.	83
Voluntary Clergy and Emigration Roland Allen, M.A.	87
Two Notes on the Christology of Athanasius C. E. Raven, B.D.	94
In Memoriam:—	
John Edward Mercer	98
William Alban Cunningham-Craig	99
Book Notices:—	
The Greatest Need of the Church	101
The Modernism of Bishop Gore	101
The Pastoral Epistles	104
The Origin of the Fourth Gospel	105
Priestcraft and Politics	106
Correspondence	108
Churchmen's Union Notices	112

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: AMERICA—C. H. DANIELS, 49 West 55th Street, New York, U.S.A.
SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
AUSTRALIA—A. McCUBBIN & Co., 152 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.
NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 102 Wakefield Street, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, M.A.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt., M.A.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D.
The Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.

Members of the Council, 1921-22.

Chairman—Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Miss E. M. ALLEN, M.A.
Professor Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Rev. C. BASS, M.A.
Right Rev. A. HAMILTON BAYNES, D.D.
Rev. J. WORSLEY BODEN, M.A.
Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., D.D.
Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt.
Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A.
Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
Mr. W. B. GORDON.
Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.
The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., C.V.O.
The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBS.
Principal F. B. JEVONS, Litt.D.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Mrs. MICHELMORE.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Mr. CLAUD MULLINS.
CYRIL NORWOOD, D.Litt.
Miss D. NUSSEY.
Rev. C. E. RAVEN, B.D.
The Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., [F.B.A.
Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., LL.D.
Principal Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D.
Miss MAUDE ROYDEN.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A.
Rev. E. ST. G. SCHOMBERG, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHARP, M.A.
Rev. H. R. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A.
Canon TOLLINTON, D.D.
Mr. H. F. WALKER.

Offices—10 CLIFFORD STREET, BOND STREET, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—MISS DOWELL.
Hon. Auditor—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 14 Priory Road, Kilburn, N.W.6.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., St. Aidan's Vicarage, South Shields.
Hon. Secretary to the Annual Conference—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 10/; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent free to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 2. MAY, 1922. Vol. XII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Modern Churchmen and Convocation.

The situation created by the petition of the English Church Union to Convocation praying for the authoritative condemnation of the Cambridge Conference number of the *Modern Churchman* seemed, as in 1914, to demand some form of Liberal counter-action. Accordingly a committee appointed by the Council of the Churchmen's Union drew up the following petition to the Upper House of Convocation:

The Petition of the undersigned members of the Church of England humbly showeth

That, whereas a Petition and Gravamen was presented to your venerable House by members of the English Church Union on February 15th last, your petitioners desire to submit the following considerations with respect to them.

The Petition and Gravamen presented to the Upper House of Convocation on February 15th by representatives of the English Church Union raise three distinct issues:

1. Whether the views impugned are formally heretical.
2. Whether they are essentially true or false.
3. What ought to be the attitude of the authorities of the Church towards those who reverently try to develop new aspects of truth.

With regard to these several questions we would respectfully urge the following considerations—

1. We submit that if charges of heresy are to be preferred against any of the writers in the September number of *The Modern Churchman,* the authors whom it is desired to condemn ought to be specified; the particular statements objected to should be cited, together with the particular clauses in the creeds or other formularies of the Church of England which they are alleged to contravene; and the accused persons ought to be allowed an opportunity of defence. All these things would have to

be done in a prosecution for heresy before an ecclesiastical court, and all these things are required by the ordinary considerations of justice.

It is plainly impossible to reply to charges of heresy made against unspecified propositions in unspecified documents. The suggestion that all the essays, and everything in them, are heretical is one which cannot be seriously entertained. And in so far as the opinions, to which objection is made, are indicated, they are stated in terms which would be entirely repudiated by many, if not by all, of the writers who are presumably intended.

2. The question of essential truth can only be decided by the slow process of research, by the weighing of practical results, and by the growth of a *sensus communis*, which together constitute the test of truth in all branches of human knowledge.

3. While a pronouncement made by Convocation would not decide either the question of heresy in the legal sense, or the question of essential truth, it would have an important, and (we venture to think) an unfortunate bearing upon the third question at issue. Even the severest critics of the papers read at Girton have acknowledged that they represent the sincere effort of reverent and responsible students to study and to commend the Christian Faith in the light of contemporary thought. The suggestion that your Lordships should *ex cathedra* 'declare that such opinions are contrary to the teaching of the Bible and the Church' inevitably recalls some former occasions on which books have been so condemned: for example, some of the writings of Bishop Colenso, and the volume known as *Essays and Reviews*, one of whose authors afterwards became Archbishop of Canterbury. The regrettable issues of those condemnations seem to indicate that such is not the right way of dealing with the present situation. The consequences of a judgment *ex cathedra* would be grave, for it would be interpreted as limiting the freedom of responsible students to enquire and express their opinions: it would suggest that the Church of England has no room for the type of thought represented at the Cambridge Conference: and it would be a deterrent to many candidates for ordination.

Your petitioners, who are not all members of any Church Society, nor all in agreement with the views in question, on these grounds entertain a confident hope that your Lordships will not grant the request expressed in the said Petition and Gravamen.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition was then submitted for signature to a small but representative body of Churchmen, lay and clerical, with the result that it was presented to the Upper House of Canterbury on May 2 by the Bishop of Oxford (on behalf of Dr. David, Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich), with the following signatures:

Sir William Ashley, Ph.D., *Professor of Commerce, University of Birmingham.*

The Rev. E. W. Barnes, D.Sc., F.R.S., *Canon of Westminster.*

The Right Rev. A. Hamilton Baynes, D.D., *Assistant Bishop, and Rector of St. Philip's Cathedral, Birmingham.*

The Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D., *Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, University of Cambridge.*

The Rev. A. E. Brooke, D.D., *Canon of Ely and Professor of Divinity, University of Cambridge.*

F. Crawford Burkitt, D.D., F.B.A., *Norrisian Professor of Divinity, University of Cambridge.*

The Rev. C. F. Burney, D.Litt., *Canon of Rochester and Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, University of Oxford.*

The Ven. R. H. Charles, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., *Archdeacon of Westminster.*

The Rev. A. H. Cruickshank, M.A., *Canon of Durham, and Professor of Greek and Classical Literature, University of Durham.*

Miss Lily Dougall.

The Rev. C. W. Emmet, B.D., *Fellow of University College, Oxford.*

Percy Gardner, D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., *Professor of Classical Archæology, University of Oxford.*

Arthur Gray, M.A., *Master of Jesus College, Cambridge.*

The Rev. M. G. Glazebrook, D.D., *Canon of Ely.*

The Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D., *Dean of St. Paul's.*

F. B. Jevons, Litt.D., *Principal of Hatfield College, and Professor of Philosophy, University of Durham.*

The Rev. R. H. Kennett, D.D., *Canon of Ely, and Regius Professor of Hebrew, University of Cambridge.*

J. E. King, M.A., *Headmaster of Clifton.*

The Right Rev. L. F. M. B. Smith, D.D., *Bishop Suffragan of Knaresborough.*

The Ven. A. L. Lilley, M.A., *Archdeacon of Ludlow.*

R. W. Macan, D.Litt., *Master of University College, Oxford.*

The Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D., *Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.*

The Very Rev. W. Moore Ede, D.D., *Dean of Worcester.*

The Rev. G. E. Newsom, M.A., *Canon and Vicar of St. Nicholas Cathedral, Newcastle.*

The Rev. R. L. Ottley, D.D., *Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, University of Oxford.*

The Very Rev. A. H. Page, M.A., *Dean of Peterborough.*

The Very Rev. H. Rashdall, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., *Dean of Carlisle.*

The Rev. C. E. Raven, B.D., *Rector of Bletchingley.*

The Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, M.A., *Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford.*

Sir Harry R. Reichel, LL.D., *Principal, University College of North Wales.*

The Rev. T. Guy Rogers, B.D., *Vicar of West Ham, and Hon. Canon of Chelmsford.*

The Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard, M.A., *Rector of St. Martins-in-the-Fields.*

A. L. Smith, M.A., *Master of Balliol College, Oxford.*

The Rev. Vernon F. Storr, M.A., *Canon of Westminster.*

The Rev. B. H. Streeter, D.D., *Fellow of the Queen's College, Oxford, and Canon of Hereford.*

The Rev. Tissington Tatlow, M.A., *Secretary of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland.*

W. W. Vaughan, M.A., *Headmaster of Rugby.*

C. C. J. Webb, M.A., *Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion, University of Oxford.*

The Rev. J. M. Wilson, D.D., *Canon of Worcester.*

The Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, M.A., *Rector of Winford.*

After prolonged debate, considering the amount of business which Convocation has to transact and the little time which it has at its disposal, the following resolution was passed unanimously:

'Having considered the *gravamen* signed by many members of the Lower House and transmitted to the Upper House on February 15th, and also the petition on the same subject from the President and Council of the English Church Union, and having also before it a petition to-day presented in criticism of, and opposition to, the prayer of the English Church Union, and having repeatedly, as these discussions have arisen, asserted its own unshaken conviction of the truth set forth in the Church's Creeds as to the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, this House agrees in respectfully requesting his Grace the President to convey to the memorialists the following resolution:—

'This House declares its conviction that adhesion to the teaching of the Catholic Church as set forth in the Nicene Creed—and in particular concerning the eternal pre-existence of the Son of God, His true Godhead, and His Incarnation—is essential to the life of the Church, and calls attention to the fact that the Church commissions as its ministers those only who have solemnly expressed such adhesion.

'Further, this House recognises the gain which arises from inquiry, at once fearless and reverent, into the meaning and expression of the Faith, and welcomes every aid which the thoughtful student finds in the results of sound historical and literary criticism, and of modern scientific investigation of the problems of human psychology; and it deprecates the mere blunt denunciation of contributions made by earnest men in their endeavour to bring new light to bear upon these difficult and anxious problems. At the same time it sees a grave and obvious danger in the publication of debatable suggestions as if they were ascertained truths, and emphasises the need of caution in this whole matter, especially on the part of responsible teachers in the Church.'

This resolution, in the opinion of some of those best able to judge, shows a marked advance on that passed by the same House on April 28, 1914, although drawn on very similar lines, and is, we believe, of such a character as to present no difficulty in the way of assent to any of the speakers and readers of papers at the Cambridge Conference. It is essentially a formula of comprehension, and will be welcomed as such. We would also venture to hope that it will satisfy the English Church Union, which strove just before Convocation met to 'ginger up' the bishops by sending a long letter to the Primate, containing extracts from the Conference Number of the *Modern Churchman*, warning him that 'all hope in the nature of Re-union' (we assume with Rome) 'would be more than gravely imperilled if the Archbishops and Bishops of these Provinces should fail publicly and clearly to disclaim any sort

of complicity in *or even toleration of*[1] such "erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word." ' The *Record*, in its issue of April 27, in the name of that type of Evangelicalism which it represents, supported the E.C.U. by asking: 'Are such statements to be tolerated within the Church of England?' and declared that they are such that 'by no stretch of imagination can they be brought within the four corners of the Church's Creed.'

The debate which preceded the passing of the Resolution was notable for three things:

First, the marked moderation of those bishops who are known not to be sympathetic towards Modernism. Dr. Gibson, who moved the resolution, proclaimed as vigorously as if he had been a member of the Council of the Churchmen's Union that the bishops could not arrest movements of intellectual enquiry by authority. 'Argument must be met by argument, and learning confuted by learning,' and the bishops seem, as a whole, to have accepted this very sound declaration of policy. We may remark that in these dialectical contests the defenders of traditionalism are in the happy position of being generally regarded as defenders of the faith, whereas their opponents, at first at any rate, are viewed as enemies intent on undermining the Christian religion.

The second notable thing about the debate was the silence of a number of the most influential bishops in the Southern Province. St. Ignatius charges his readers that 'so far as a man sees a bishop keeping silence, let him follow him all the more in reverence,'[2] and Modernists may well reckon episcopal silence on this occasion as partaking of that neutrality which at least is not hostile.

The third notable thing was the weighty and sympathetic speech of the Primate. His Grace referred to 'the deeply devotional atmosphere prevalent throughout the Cambridge Conference': he described some of the papers read as of 'very great value': he recognized that theological and critical questions must be debated in Conferences, but deprecated not only the publicity, but the mode of presentation of the transactions of this particular Conference: he did not desire any one of

[1] Italics ours.

[2] Eph. vi. (Zahn's text).

the readers of the papers, if he could bring his teaching in any way at all within the range of the Church of England, to be lost to the Church. Many of the Modernists, the Primate affirmed, had contributed enormously to a right understanding of the Gospel message in the light of new thought, critical, historical, and psychological. He for one was most grateful to them for it, and to some he thought he owed more than he could easily express. 'We should,' he continued, 'be doing a grave wrong to-day were we to say to such men that they were not wanted.' He concluded by warning them of the danger of presenting debatable conclusions as though they were ascertained truths.

The proceedings in the York Convocation were even more gratifying. The Lower House passed the following resolution :

That, being fully conscious of the gravity of the allegations contained in the petition of the E.C.U., and the weight to be attached thereto, the Committee nevertheless decides to recommend that no action be taken by the Lower House in the matter at the present juncture; and that it is encouraged in this decision by the knowledge that the question is at the moment occupying the attention of the Upper House.

The Upper House, with a full attendance of twelve prelates, adopted unanimously a report the substance of which was as follows :—

It does not appear to us desirable to discuss in detail the papers or speeches recorded in the *Modern Churchman*. They do not form a coherent body of teaching; they are not consistent with one another; though there are many statements in them which appear to us misleading and dangerous, there are also many with which we cordially agree. We think it better, therefore, to put forward certain propositions of a more general character.

We are bound to recall the attention of the Church to the fact that, in the Providence of God, the faith once delivered has been interpreted to successive ages by means of inquiry and discussion. The whole history of religion and theology illustrates this. While therefore we are well aware that the process necessarily causes pain and trial of faith to many devout persons in every age, we hold that the experience of the Church decisively discourages attempts to arrest movements of the intellect and conscience by exercise of authority. We have to take into account the fact that the advance of science and criticism has forced upon the Church the necessity of reviewing the traditional theology, with the object of disentangling the unalterable faith from whatever in its setting may be discovered to be obsolete or misleading, and restating it in terms more congruous with our present knowledge, and for that reason more intelligible and edifying to modern Christians. If we are indeed justified in believing that the Holy Spirit guides the Church into all the truth, we are bound to encourage Christian scholars in such investigations. The writers in the *Modern*

Churchman claim to be endeavouring to express in terms of modern thought the ancient doctrine of the Church, and so far we cannot but approve their intention. It must not, however, be forgotten that the method of special public conferences, in matters of such gravity, is not itself well adapted to advance the cause of religious truth. In such gatherings the discussions are apt to proceed under conditions unfavourable to the caution and reserve which the subject demands. The Christian conscience is affronted by premature declarations, which are often exaggerated, and even perverted by newspaper reports.

In view, therefore, of the widely-spread distress of mind caused by the public conference recently held at Cambridge, we would remind the Church that the Godhead of Jesus Christ is not only the rock upon which Christianity from the first has rested, but also the only valid pledge of its persistence in a changing world. No doctrine of the Incarnation appears to us adequate or even tolerable which detracts from the uniqueness of His Sonship. The Church worships God in Christ, and reveres in the crucified Jesus the supreme revelation of the love of God reconciling a sinful race by the sacrifice of Himself. No reconstruction of theology can be in our judgment satisfactory if it disturbs the proportion of the faith as it has been for ever established in the writings of the Apostles, which must always remain the standard of doctrine and the primary tests of theological speculation. It is precisely because the ancient creeds of the undivided Church express with singular power this fundamental truth, the Godhead of Christ, and set forth the faith of the Church in its due proportion, that we hold them to be not merely qualified for the use of the modern Church, but also possessed of an unique and priceless value as setting forth the essential identity of Christian belief in all ages.

We are fully persuaded that there is no valid reason for consternation, but much for patience, for the temper of mutual tolerance, for earnest prayer, for rigorous and reverent thinking. Instead, then, of yielding to panic let the faithful Christian make an act of faith in the Holy Spirit, and invoke His guidance for the Church's leaders and thinkers in these anxious and difficult times. To-day, as fully as in any earlier age, Christ is with His people, proving His presence beyond possibility of mistake by His redemptive activity, and therein we still possess the original root of Christian faith, and find the sufficient reason for our own discipleship. The ever-renewed experience in the Christian life of this living Presence at once implies and attests the faith that Jesus Christ, as very God and very Man, is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.

The Growth of a Myth.

In the Canterbury Convocation debate a converging fire was directed on the Preface of the Conference Number of the *Modern Churchman*. The *Guardian* thus cites one of the most important statements made in Convocation in this connection :

'The damage was done by putting out the report under an editorship and with a preface which tried to weld it into the form of a book and to present it with a statement in which the word "we" had the appearance of meaning the writers in the book; and as though "we," the writers, gave a kind of challenge to the Church at large—a kind of ultimatum. The whole of the last part of the preface put the whole case in a way which had made the mischief that had arisen.'

Any intelligent person, reading these condemnations of the Preface, and unacquainted with the real facts of the case, would assume that the Cambridge Conference might have passed off without comment if it had not been for the Preface prefixed to the publication of the papers. We may be permitted to remind our critics that a storm of protest and lamentation, far exceeding anything which followed on the publication of the Preface, burst forth in press and pulpit nearly a month before the Preface saw the light of day. And we would add that among the most vigorous of these protesters were Bishop Gore, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford, and Canon Peter Green. If anyone will take the trouble to read the thousands of press references to the Cambridge Conference, he will find that as a matter of fact the Preface, when it subsequently appeared, attracted far less notice than a number of the more important Conference papers. Moreover, in the more reputable journals the publication of the Conference Number created a favourable impression, *e.g.* the *Literary Supplement* of the *Times* (September 22) welcomed it with the words that the papers in that number

> 'show sympathy with what is in men's minds at the present day' and 'are important for all students of Christology';

and the Right Hon. C. F. G. Masterman wrote on October 14th:

> 'I wish they (the Conference papers) could be read by every minister of religion and by every layman who has any belief in any but a purely materialist interpretation of the universe.'

The supposition that the editorial 'we' of the Preface expressed the deliberate judgment of the contributors of the Conference papers, rather than the impression which the Conference papers and speeches made on the mind of the editor, has as little support as that the Preface was the cause of the mischief. Bishop Gore, when in the *Church Times* of September 23 he criticized a statement in the Preface, criticized it as the opinion of Mr. Major, and it required little acumen for him to do so, inasmuch as the Preface was stated at its head to be 'By the Editor.'

The charge that the Preface misrepresented the mind of the Conference is not so easy to meet. The editor has received

only one criticism from a member of the Conference. This was on October 13. He took exception to the sentence, which the Primate had already criticized,[3] and which voiced the Modernist desire for the formulation of new creeds and their alternative use subject to episcopal sanction. He was of the opinion that the majority of Modernists did not desire this, and regarded the proposal as injudicious, but in taking exception to the proposal, he added, ' I hoped the general excellence of the Preface might cause it to pass unnoticed.'

Another prominent member of the Conference, whose wide experience and good judgment are held in the highest esteem among Liberal Churchmen, and whose own Conference paper escaped all criticism, wrote to the editor on September 26th :

> ' People are very pleased with your Preface, and I am sure it was both right and good policy to make it as little provocative as possible, while saying clearly what needs to be said. People have found nothing to fasten on in it.'

When it is recollected that the Preface was written not merely as an ordinary introduction to a collection of theological papers but also in reply to a heavy and unjust attack, and that therefore it had to perform the functions of both an apology and an exposition, it will not seem unreasonable that it should have taken the form it did. In any case, the assumption that the Preface helped largely to produce the attack on the Conference, instead of being a restrained reply to that attack, is an interesting example of the rapid growth of myth, and, in this case, not among ignorant masses, but among a small body of educated persons. Happily it is a myth which critical investigation has little difficulty in dissipating.

The psychological origin and significance of the myth is not without interest, but there is no need to deal with it now.

The Headship of Christ.

Under the title ' Back to Christ,' the *Guardian* of May 5th publishes a striking sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on April 30th by the Rev. E. S. Woods, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Cambridge, and Chairman of the Life and Liberty Movement. It forms a fitting pendant to the Convocation debate. Preaching from *Eph.* I, 22, ' Christ . . . the head over every-

[3] In his Birmingham Church Congress Sermon.

thing for the Church,' Mr. Woods asked whether the belief found an adequate response in actuality:

'We talk glibly of His headship over the Church; how far does the Church, in concrete fact, recognise Him and treat Him as Head? Can we say that, forsaking all other issues, the Church devotes its main energies to the things which Jesus Christ clearly regards as being of supreme importance? I must in honesty confess that these questions fill me with considerable misgiving . . . I cannot resist the impression that the Church of England at any rate is spending much of its energy without adequate reference to the mind and purpose of the true Head of the Church.

'I will give two instances of what I mean. One is what I would call the over-complex and over-organized institutionalism of the Church. No one would deny that the Church is meant to be an institution, nor that it should organise itself properly. But the Head of the Church, if we are to judge by what He said and did on earth, cannot have intended it to be a self-centred institution or to spend most of its energies in organising its own existence. But that, in point of fact, is what is happening. An altogether disproportionate amount of time and labour is spent on the complex details of administration. We cannot see the wood for the trees. There is all too little to remind us what these ant-like activities are really for, what objective the Church is supposed to be pursuing . . . As a Church we are not organised for war; we are not over eager for close and biting contact with the stark realities of evil. We are engrossed in other things, like the London church I heard of the other day which, with a great struggle, has to find £500 a year to pay for its music alone. And there is some danger that the National Assembly may become entangled in similar meshes. All would agree that the Church's central organization needs such careful and thorough overhauling as the National Assembly is beginning to take in hand. But to assert, as a prominent politician who is a member of that Assembly has asserted, that the Assembly's functions should be confined to business and finance, is to suggest a perilous divorce between the task of that Assembly and the kind of work which Jesus Christ has commissioned the Church to accomplish.

'Another instance of our ecclesiastical disregard of the Head of the Church is to be found in the un-Christian prevalence in the Church of party feeling and party activity. "Parties," in one sense, there must be and should be, that is, the full life of the Church ought always to be fed and enriched by very different streams of Christian thought and Christian experience. But parties in the sense of groups of like-minded religious people claiming, in effect, to have a monopoly of truth, and striving, by all sorts of means, to make their particular point of view predominant in the Church—parties, in this sense, are, I believe, utterly alien from the Mind of Christ, and constitute a grave menace to the true well-being of the Church. It is with dismay that I see one great party in the Church making a prodigious effort to capture the new electoral machine. It is with equal dismay that I watch the extremist section of another party striving to capture the Church's biggest missionary society, and to exclude from it those who cannot pronounce their shibboleths. Not so will Christ's Headship of the Church be vindicated. Not so will men see in the Church that which could attract them to Jesus Christ. Rather will they turn wistfully away, repelled by chilling controversies and barren activities, and seek elsewhere for that which may feed their souls.'

Having indicated the temptations to which the Church is yielding, or at least the dangers to which it is exposed, Mr. Woods dealt with the only Church policy which is able to secure salvation for the Church and nation.

'I dare to say that the time has come for a "Back to Christ" Movement in all the Churches and not least in our own. Not just back to the Jesus of history, but back and up to the Christ alive to-day, mankind's eternal contemporary . . . I am aware of the danger of leaving such a phrase as "Back to Christ" undefined, or of allowing it to stand as a mere catchword. What would be really involved in a re-assertion in the Church of the absolute supremacy of Jesus Christ? What actual difference would it make? It would, of course, make an enormous difference in tone, in atmosphere, in the quality of the Church's common life. And it would certainly express itself in a revision of values. We should get a truer sense of proportion, and learn to put first things first.'

Of the 'first things,' Mr. Woods indicated three. The first is *Evangelism* in the simplest and most fundamental form, the production of the love of God in Christ. But this has to be no mere lip-proclamation, nor will it be effective if it is merely conventional either in word or deed.

'It needs to be pointed out that effective evangelism will not be achieved by a sonorous repetition of ancient shibboleths. We have got to see afresh for ourselves, and to make other men see, that God is like Jesus Christ, and that therefore He is Love, and has nothing to do with force of any kind. We shall never evangelise effectively unless we are making, and men see that we are making, adventurous experiments in living by the law of Christ. We shall never make much impression on our generation as long as the world thinks, and has cause to think, that the Church is not making a serious attempt to practise the Gospel which it preaches.'

The second follows from the first. It is *Reformulation* of doctrine, and that in no theoretical fashion, but by providing truthful and inspiring Church services and confessions of faith.

'If our true function as a Church is to exhibit Christ, to present Christ to the world, then not only must we remove things from our ecclesiastical system which effectually hinder such exhibition of Christianity (here is the real point of all Church reform), but we must also take pains to ensure that our formulated statements do with sufficient adequacy express the Christianity by which we live, and which we desire to set forth to our generation. Do our Creeds and formularies do this? The beauty and devotional value of much in our liturgy is unquestionable. But, as a whole, and in certain parts, does our Prayer-book, untouched for three hundred years, adequately express the corporate Christian mind of to-day? Do Matins and Evensong put into words the many things we want to pray about? Do the Baptismal, Marriage, and Burial Services express in convincing fashion the mind of Christ about the tremendous

events of human life with which they deal? Do the Thirty-nine Articles satisfyingly set forth for us to-day the riches of our Faith and the glories of the Kingdom of God? Once again to questions such as these I for one am not able to give an affirmative answer. And, in my own humble belief, if we wish truly to follow Christ and to preach Christ, we must make the attempt, however daunting the difficulties, to re-express in our formularies what is really signified by faith in the God of Jesus Christ.

The third is *Corporate unselfishness.*

'We do lip-service to this principle. We press it upon individuals. We urge it upon classes and nations as the only final solution of social and international difficulties. Why cannot we act upon it in our mutual relations as Churches? Why, if we are Christ's, must we imitate the world in its struggle for power, in its strife as to who shall be the greatest? If Christ was really treated as Head by all the Churches we should never be satisfied, in our mutual relations, with a mere passive toleration; we should hunt out ways to help each other's work, and, above all, we should each be prepared for a very large measure of sacrifice if so we could come together again in the rich oneness which God means us to have. I should like, in this connection, to repeat with gratitude and emphasis the plain words of a great Christian thinker of to-day, who points out that "the ideal type of institution for a religion like Christianity would be one which was entirely indifferent to its own fortunes as an institution, and prepared at any moment to die in order to live. The distribution of its energies would be the reverse of that which now obtains. Nearly all would go into the attack upon the gloom, misery, and ignorance of the world; next to nothing would go into the defence of vested interests, whether they take the form of Creeds, property, power, position, or prestige." '[4]

If in response to the trumpet-call of its Chairman, the Life and Liberty Movement with its great gifts of energy and organization will now devote itself primarily to the promotion of these three aims, it will be performing the greatest of services to English Christianity and will be helping to realise that ideal which the Conference of Modern Churchmen held at Cambridge in 1921, had in view.

[4] Dr. L. P. Jacks on *Institutional Selfishness* in the *Modern Churchman* for March.

FACT AND MODE IN BIOLOGY AND IN THEOLOGY

By the Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A., Chaplain of Ripon Hall, Oxford; author of *Religion and Science from Galileo to Bergson.*

IN *The Origin of Species* (1859) Darwin, in order to avoid exciting prejudice against his work, made no definite application of the theory of Natural Selection to the case of Man, but merely observed that 'light would be thrown on the origin of man and his history' by the new conceptions. It was not until 1873 that *The Descent of Man* clearly indicated how the new biology had effected traditional ideas about human origins.

Lamarck also had displayed similar, or even greater, caution; after pointing out at length the ties by which man is united in his physical organization to the lower animals, he said:

> 'Such would be the reflections which one might make if man . . . were only distinguished from the animals by the characters of his organisation, and if his origin were not different from theirs.'[1]

The prejudice which made these reservations necessary is not to be regarded, however, as merely childish or wanton. We have to recognize that immense human importance was formerly attached to what is now regarded as obsolete biology. The Darwinian theory seemed to contradict the entire *Weltanschauung*, which dominated the minds and imaginations of Christian people. To link man with the beasts seemed to cut away the ground from underneath all those higher and nobler conceptions of humanity which had been so difficult to acquire and might be very easy to lose. It seemed that Darwin was asking for the sacrifice of the most essential human values.

It is easy for us *now* to see that this was not the case. We are accustomed to the idea that a thing is to be judged not by its origin, but by its end or purpose or 'ideal.' Yet we should remember that this very idea was the product of a period of

[1] *Philosophie Zoologique*, Tom. 1, p. 357.

storm and stress; what now seems to us a commonplace was once (and not so very long ago either) a hard-won solution of an apparently insoluble problem. We may in our superiority smile at the efforts of Tennyson to reconcile ideas which seem to us quite harmonious, but in his day things were very different, and a great gulf lay between Darwinism and Christianity.

Thus we live intellectually and spiritually on the efforts of our predecessors. Of course it is true that 'every solution of a problem constitutes a fresh problem,' but definite advances in thought are made, and our direction is forward, not backward, provided always that civilization does not collapse, as it did in the fifth century.

Hence it is a little discouraging to observe a tendency to throw overboard the intellectual capital we possess; to ignore the work done by Tennyson (and others), and to say that Darwin's theories are incapable of any kind of religious interpretation. Nor, as it would appear, is it ecclesiastical authority of any kind which is taking this line of policy, but (what is far more serious) political democracy itself, upon which freedom of thought has always been held to rest.

The scientific correspondent of the *Times* draws attention (April 11, 1922) to some singular phenomena now taking place in the United States. We learn that Mr. Jennings Bryan, formerly a candidate for the Presidency, and still a great power in the States of the West and Middle West, has led a virulent campaign against Darwinism and Evolution. Evolution 'destroys man's family tree as taught by the Bible,' is 'harmful as well as groundless,' and 'entirely changes one's view of life and undermines faith in the Bible.'

These singular observations might not call for any remark were it not for the fact that there seems to exist in the States a fairly large public to which such views are congenial, and to which no doubt they are addressed. Of this, some evidence is produced which in another country would seem astonishing.

For example, a Bill in the Kentucky legislature to make the teachings of evolution an offence punishable by a fine of from 500 to 1,000 dollars has just been defeated by a majority of one vote. 'Its prospects were taken so seriously that the

presidents of most of the American Universities sent telegrams of protest to Kentucky.' Again, the Oklahoma State Baptist Association has passed a resolution condemning evolution and appointed a committee to eradicate this 'heresy' from the schools of their State; an example which the Texas Southern Baptists and a congress of the Disciples of Christ are hoping to imitate. These 'Rocky Mountain Toughs,' to use the late William James' phrase, are accustomed, we are informed, to class Evolution and Darwinism 'with alcohol, tobacco, and low "shirt-waists."'

Mr. Bryan seems to have taken as the text for his manifesto a perhaps rather ill-judged remark made by Professor Bateson, the distinguished authority on variation and heredity, at a meeting of specialists at Toronto, that 'the Mendelian method has failed to explain the origin of species'; a statement which the Canadian Press seems to have trumpeted loudly as equivalent to a collapse of the Evolution theory.

The high hopes which were placed on the discoveries of Mendel as likely to ease considerably the difficulties of Natural Selection have certainly not been realized. Yet it should be observed that it still remains possible to believe in Evolution, even though the exact method by which Evolution was accomplished may still be obscure. Professor Bateson, writing in 1913, makes this clear enough even (one might suppose) for Mr. Bryan:

> 'The many converging lines of evidence point so clearly to the central fact of the origin of the forms of life by an evolutionary process that we are compelled to accept this deduction; but as to almost all the essential features, whether of cause or of mode, by which specific diversity has become what we perceive it to be, we have to confess an ignorance nearly total.'[2]

Here we see emphasized the really important distinction between the *fact* of evolution (which seems to lie beyond dispute) and its *mode* (where there is room for much diversity of opinion). While all biologists seem to agree that species are the product of a process of evolution, there is no unanimity as to what exactly the method of that process may have been. But it is misrepresentation of the facts to say that differences

[2] *Problems of Genetics*, p. 248.

about the *mode* of evolution are either the result, or the cause, of scepticism about the *fact* of evolution.

It is interesting for the student of ideas to observe a certain parallelism between this confusion of thought in the biological sphere and a similar confusion in the theological sphere. In the latter sphere, the two distinct ideas, *fact* and *mode*, have been so confused that clear thinking has become very difficult. Instability of opinion about mode has been interpreted as evidence of scepticism about fact; and if the traditional *mode* be rejected on historical grounds, it is felt that the *fact* is somehow compromised. So that a man who has doubts about the Virgin Birth or the Empty Tomb is held to have doubts about, or even flatly to deny, the Incarnation and the Resurrection.

To do the biologists justice, not many of them would be guilty of this kind of confusion of thought. It is only the rather ill-informed layman, for thus we are compelled to regard Mr. Jennings Bryan, that can darken counsel in this way. Even Professor Bateson himself, who is held by some to carry hostility to Darwinian theories of Natural Selection to extremes, never seems to cast doubt upon the fact of evolution. He confesses nearly total ignorance about its mode, but about the fact he has no doubts whatever. His statement is quite clear:

> 'That species have come into existence by an evolutionary process no one seriously doubts.'[3]

Indeed, biologists have so few doubts about the fact of evolution that they rarely allude to it. And if they devote less space than might be anticipated to the topic of evolution, it is not because they doubt the validity of that theory, but because they take it for granted, and prefer not to enlarge upon what goes without saying. When they do deal with the subject, there is no ambiguity. Professor J. A. Thomson, for example, writes as follows:

> 'The evolution formula is not demonstrable like that of gravitation. It is a way of looking at things that fits, that is luminous, that meets with no contradiction, that serves as an *organon* of discovery. It is the only known scientific way of answering the question: How has the present-day system of Animate Nature come into being?'[4]

Professor Thomson proceeds to recapitulate some of the facts which have impressed biologists, and inspired their con-

[3] *Op. cit.*, Preface. [4] *The System of Animate Nature*, p. 367.

viction that the origin of species has been 'evolutionary.' He alludes to the similarities, or 'homologies,' between 'the fore-limb of a frog, the paddle of a turtle, the wing of a bird, the foreleg of a horse, the flipper of a whale, the wing of a bat, or the arm of a man.' He then asks how we are to interpret those numerous vestigial structures in the higher animals:

> 'The two sets of teeth in whalebone whales that never cut the gum, the deeply buried representatives of hip girdle and hind leg in many Cetaceans, the hint of a third eye-lid in man,' if they are not 'historical vestiges, like the unsounded letters in many words, to use Darwin's comparison.'
>
> Again, what, apart from evolution, can be the significance of 'the classifiability of organisms into varieties, species, genera, families, orders, classes, and phyla, of the "connecting links" and "synthetic types" '? Why does the blood of a horse mingle harmoniously with that of an ass, and a hare's with a rabbit's, 'while man's blood added to any of them produces destruction of corpuscles'?
>
> Furthermore, there are the phenomena of artificial breeding, in themselves very illuminating; and, finally there is the 'rock record.' This 'discloses the lineage of horse and elephant, crocodile and ammonite; it yields missing links to the sceptic; it shows us above all that, as age succeeded age, there was an emergence of nobler and nobler forms of life.'[5]

And indeed, with regard to this last point, it was no mere coincidence that Darwin's theories followed hard upon the new geology of Lyell, of which they were, in fact, a corollary. And, we imagine, there are few geologists who are not evolutionists, at least if they pay any attention to the palaeontological aspects of their subject. Most of them would agree with the distinguished zoologist, Professor Arthur Dendy, when he writes:

> 'So far as the animal kingdom is concerned, we may perhaps say without exaggeration that the succession in time of the different groups, as indicated by the geological record, amounts to positive demonstration of the truth of the theory of organic evolution. In the case of plants the record is perhaps not quite so clear, but here also there can be no reasonable doubt that the great groups succeeded one another in a manner consistent with the theory, commencing with the algæ and ending with the flowering plants of the present day.'[6]

There is no need to labour the point further; in spite of differences of opinion about the mode of evolution, there exists

[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 368*f*. Thomson, also, alludes to the phenomena of 'recapitulation' in the embryo, whereby each individual climbs up his own genealogical tree.

[6] *Outlines of Evolutionary Biology*, p. 304.

complete unanimity of opinion that the origin of species has been evolutionary. Or, we should perhaps add, it exists among those who have the qualifications necessary for judging in a matter of this kind.

Thus a biologist may be a Lamarckian and believe that the mode of evolution has been the transmission and accumulation of acquired characteristics. Or, on the other hand, he may be a Darwinian and believe in the natural selection and accumulation of chance variations. But in neither case will his belief in evolution as a fact be affected or disputed. It is true that the uninstructed may interpret his latitude about mode as evidence of scepticism about fact, as Mr. Bryan seems to have done in the case of Professor Bateson; but such interpretations are promptly repudiated by the biologists themselves.

In point of fact, the biological world seems to hold that Dr. Bateson has gone too far in his anti-Darwinism. Professor Poulton, for instance, in an Essay on Mutation, Mendelism, and Natural Selection, in his *Essays on Evolution* (1908), observes that when he looked into the English publications on the above subjects 'and the earlier works of Bateson on Variation,' he was 'almost startled at the narrowness and prejudice which were continually apparent.' He finds the following faults in the Mendelian and Mutationist critics of Natural Selection: (1) Dogmatism concerning work with which the writers are evidently imperfectly acquainted. (2) Assumptions made by Mutationists on the slenderest evidence. (3) The appropriation under the name of Mendel of results which the present generation owes to Weismann. (4) The exaggerated estimate of the importance for Evolution of Bateson's work on Variation, and Mendel's interesting discovery. (5) The contemptuous depreciation of other lines of investigation directly inspired by the work and teaching of Darwin and Wallace. (6) The natural consequence of this last—a widespread belief among the ill-informed that the teachings of the founders of modern biology are abandoned.[7]

It is not necessary for us to enter into the controversy between the two Professors; for their controversy is one about

[7] *Op. cit.*, pp. xiii *f.*

the mode, and not about the fact of evolution. Yet it is perhaps a pity if, in his enthusiasm for the fresh light shed on the problem of variations by Mendel and De Vries, Professor Bateson should have depreciated the work of Darwin, and too hastily attacked the theory of Natural Selection. For the result evidently has been to cast doubts upon the very fact of evolution in the mind of the ignorant.

And here we are back again at our parallel between biologists and theologians: for biologists are not the only people who have been misinterpreted for propagandist purposes. It is true that Professor Bateson, in attacking (perhaps too vigorously) the theory of Natural Selection, was not attacking evolution; but if it seems to be to the interests of some political faction that he should be represented as doing so, the misrepresentation is sure to be made. So also with the theologian. In attacking the Virgin Birth, he is not necessarily attacking the doctrine of the Incarnation; he may, on the contrary, even be defending the latter against ridicule or caricature. But if it seems to be to the interests of some ecclesiastical faction that he should be represented as doing so, that misrepresentation is sure to be made. No cynical theory, but history and experience teach this. The sapient Bishop Burnet was alive to the phenomenon a couple of centuries ago. Speaking of the Latitudinarians, he says, not without some touch of bitterness:

> 'Many of the latter had managed the controversies with the Church of Rome with so much clearness and with that success, that the Papists, to revenge themselves, and to blast those whom they considered as their most formidable enemies, had cast aspersions on them as Socinians, and as men that denied all mysteries. And now some angry men at Oxford, who apprehended that those divines were likely to be most considered in this reign, took up the same method of calumny, and began to treat them as Socinians. The Earl of Clarendon and some of the bishops . . . took much ill-natured pains to spread these slanders.'[8]

There exists only one antidote to such misrepresentation, and that is knowledge and information in those to whom the misrepresentation is made, *i.e.* the general public. But the

[8] *History of his own Times* (Everyman Edition), p. 317.

general public (at any rate in America) seems ready enough to accept the ill-considered statements of Mr. Bryan. Nor does there seem to be amongst ourselves any shortage of demand for similar misrepresentations in the theological sphere. Dispute about mode can be represented as scepticism about fact with equal ease in either case.

That the general public should accept fallacious statements may not perhaps seem a matter of any importance to the biologists. They pay it the tribute of a smile or a sigh, and pass on to more important matters. Yet if the Kentucky legislation and the Oklahoma Baptists were to get their way, grave injury would be done to the cause of truth. Science once more would be in chains; having escaped from the old tyranny of the ecclesiastic, she would experience the omnipotent, new tyranny of the demagogue—against whom there is no appeal, for *vox populi, vox dei.*

Theology, too, is in similar danger. It is not ecclesiastical authority that theologians now have to fear, for episcopal authority is becoming more well-informed. The danger is rather of the tyranny of an uninstructed multitude of the devout (perhaps composed mainly of good women), who in the last resort dictate to episcopal authority what it shall and what it shall not tolerate. Against this dictatorship of the pious *proletariate* there is no appeal. What is the result to be? To quote the unhappy Reginald Peacock:

> 'I know not, but I leave it to others; for my own part I dread —and pray.'

CHINA AND MODERNISM

By the Rev. F. E. A. Shepherd, M.A., American Church Mission, Wu Chang, China.

I HAVE been trying lately to write an article for the monthly publication called *The Chinese Recorder*, which shall explain Modernism to missionaries in China without giving offence to any. It is of course impossible to estimate how much one may offend unintentionally, but this is by no means the whole of the problem here. For instance, an article by Dean Inge on the subject, 'What is a Liberal Churchman?' appeared recently in the *Challenge*, in which the Dean refers to the belief that the world was created six thousand years ago as among the things which 'no educated people can or do believe.' I fear such a statement would cause offence to quite a few of our older missionaries!

It is a necessary part of the consideration of the message of Modernism to China to know something of the types of missionaries that one finds here, although a caution as to the fallaciousness of statistics may be added. It is easy to collect statistics of missionaries and their converts, and it is broadly true that the Missionary Societies represent particular schools of thought; but it is by no means clear what school of thought the converts represent. He is a wise man who, in this country, knows what his converts believe! Add to the difficulty of grasping another man's point of view a language apparently framed to conceal thought, and you will see that the Chinese may be superlatively inscrutable when you seek to ascertain his religious opinions.

The statistics of missions in China may be read for what they are worth by anyone who has access to the books wherein they are published. Here is given some more general information derived from personal experience and intercourse.

In the summer of 1920 a great stir was caused at Kuling, a popular summer resort in China, by the leader of the annual

conference of missionaries. He denounced many aspects of modern thought, taking a combative attitude and declaring that the parting of the ways had been reached; no Traditionalist could henceforth work with Modernists. It is significant of the growth of the spirit of union that the heresy-hunt which seemed likely to be inaugurated petered out. Nevertheless the Bible Union of China was formed, a copy of whose tentative statement I append in a footnote.[1] This statement ex-

[1] *Tentative Statement of the Bible Union of China.*

Being convinced that the state of both the Christian and non-Christian world demands unity of purpose and steadfastness of effort in preaching and teaching the fundamental and saving truths revealed in the Bible, especially those now being assailed, such as, the Deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, His Virgin Birth, His Atoning Sacrifice for sin, and His Bodily Resurrection from the Dead; the Miracles both of the Old and New Testaments; the Personality and Work of the Holy Spirit; the New Birth of the Individual and the necessity of this as an essential prerequisite to Christian Social Service:

We reaffirm our faith in the whole Bible as the inspired Word of God and the ultimate source of authority for Christian faith and practice; And unitedly signify our purpose 'to contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.'

To this end we express our desire to join with others of like mind in seeking to carry out the following programme:—

1. Prayer: To pray that God may so direct this movement as to arouse the Church of Christ to its deep need of a firmer grasp on the fundamentals of the Christian faith and a fresh realization of the power and sufficiency of the simple Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, the preaching and teaching of which has been blessed of God since the beginning of missionary work.

2. The Bible: To promote the circulation, reading, and study of the Bible, trusting that its Divine Author will use this movement as a testimony to its integrity and authority.

3. Literature: To prepare and circulate literature and text-books witnessing to the fundamental truths of the Bible.

4. Personnel: To present to our Home Boards and supporters the vital importance of accepting for missionary service only such candidates as accept the truths referred to above.

5. Educational Institutions: To stand firm for faithful teaching of the whole Bible as of primary importance in the work of all Christian schools and colleges: and also by deputation work, conferences, and special lectureships, help forward local effort in emphasizing the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

6. Theological Education: To promote sound teaching in theological seminaries and Bible schools, and to seek means by which able exponents of the faith may reach the present and future leaders of the Chinese Church.

7. Evangelism: To forward all measures in Christian enterprises which make for the deepening of their devotional, evangelistic, and missionary spirit.

presses views considerably modified from the original pronouncement. The membership of the Bible Union at present stands at about 1,500 (the total number of missionaries in China being upwards of 7,000). Their position is substantially that of the extensive China Inland Mission—although not all the members of the C.I.M. have joined it—of the Presbyterians and Baptists from the south of the United States and of several less known sects. The C.I.M. are known to be committed to a belief in everlasting retributive punishment.

The same summer a sermon was preached at Kuling by a Mr. Trumbull, editor of the *Sunday School Times* of the U.S.A. In reply to a question prompted by this sermon, he wrote a letter from which the following is taken. (This quotation, although removed from its context, is representative of the whole letter.) It runs:

> 'I do believe that all Biblical critics who discuss the Bible from the more or less agnostic position that the material they are discussing may or may not be true—that is, historically accurate, and inerrant in all other ways—are, of course unconciously, on the side of those who are tempted and used by the Adversary Satan in his age-long campaign to destroy men's faith in the Word of God. You are indeed right in saying that the implications involved in this view seem to be very serious. And I do not believe that those who deny the uniquely God-breathed inspiration, authority, infallibility, and inerrancy of the entire Bible *can* "cast out the devils of ignorance and prejudice," to quote from your letter. I used to believe, as you suggest, that there was a legitimate distinction between what is sometimes called conservative criticism and radical criticism. I now believe that there is no fundamental distinction between the two wings of the critical school, except that the conservative criticism would seem to be more dangerous and harmful than the radical, just as poison that is labelled safe for general use is more dangerous than poison that is obviously deadly.'

One passage from a further letter will probably interest readers of the *Modern Churchman*. In this Mr. Trumbull writes:

> 'I see no difficulty in believing that the universe was created in six days if that is what the Bible record declares. On the other hand, many devout Christians believe that the record of the six days in the first chapter of Genesis is a record, not of creation but of restoration of a universe earlier created and then wrecked or thrown into chaos, having become waste and void by a cataclysm that occurred between the first and second verses of the first chapter of Genesis. I understand that the Hebrew text suggests this, and that it is in keeping with such passages as *Jeremiah* iv, 23-26; *Isaiah* xxiv, 1; xlv, 18.'

After this the higher criticism seems merely negligible!

I have also received lately a letter from a prominent missionary in Canton in connection with some correspondence in *The Chinese Recorder*. One paragraph is worth quoting, as it shows that the lie of the denial of Christ's divinity passes current here. (I wrote and corrected this and also an extract from a home paper published in the local press to the same effect at the time of the Conference at Girton.) This paragraph runs:

> 'Our Lord Jesus Christ was Divine. His death atoned for sin by the shedding of His blood on Calvary. Now the Devil (probably you do not believe in that personage?) hates this doctrine and tries to turn men's thoughts away from it. In Roman Catholicism, Salvation is attained by good works and by the purifying fires of purgatory, not by Faith in Christ. In Christian Science, the existence of sin is denied, and with sin goes all need for a sacrifice. In Millenial Dawnism the Divinity of Christ is denied, so that He cannot offer a Divine sacrifice. In Modernism the Divinity of Christ is denied, in fact His existence is denied in "The Origin and Meaning of Christianity" by the Rev. G. T. Sadler, B.D., published this year, I think. In these four widely-differing cults we have one common factor, *i.e.* a setting aside of Christ as the Divine Saviour of a lost race, all four being directed by Satan to that end.'

Anyone who knows something of the S.P.G., the C.M.S., the London Missionary Society, the other larger denominational societies in England and the U.S.A., and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, none of whom are committed to these extreme views and among whom are many of a liberal cast of thought, is now in a fair position to estimate the situation out here.

Let us turn to a consideration of the Chinese. An article, published in the *Chinese Recorder*, by Mr. P. C. Hsu, formerly Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. in Peking and now studying in New York, gives Modernists some food for thought. After discussing the revival movements of Buddhism and Confucianism in this country, the attitude of students to Christianity and its general influence, he goes on to discuss the points at issue between conservatives and liberals, and the question of unity.

In regard to the first of these matters, he deprecates contention. He believes, he says, 'that there ought to be enough in common between conservatives and liberals so that they could work out a common platform, and that all quarrel over hair-splitting differences is non-essential.' He further believes 'that Christianity has a real message to give to China, and that

Chinese Christians can make a genuine contribution to the discovery, interpretation, and presentation of that message, provided they are left alone by over-confident missionaries.'

In regard to unity he writes:

> 'The lack of a strong united front accounts largely for the slow progress of the Church. There is no reason whatever for forcing these western divisions on China. Perhaps due allowances should always be made in view of the fact that human beings differ in their temperaments and points of view, but that is no justification for the present state of affairs. Upon the ability and extent of co-operation among the Christians and the Churches depends very largely the future of Christianity in China.'

There must even, Mr. Hsu thinks, be toleration and appreciation for non-Christian religions.

This question of union needs little comment. It is one of the objects of the Churchmen's Union to further co-operation between all Christian bodies. We, who are working here, take courage in the measure of unity that has been achieved, while fully admitting our faults and recognizing the stumbling-block that our divisions create.

Concerning the differences between conservatives and liberals: it would seem that the Chinese take little interest in controversial questions and that re-statement, as such, is not likely to prove a live issue with them. They want a Gospel which presents what is at the heart of Christianity before it is obscured by the veneer of credal statement and institutional religion. A Modernist mission would probably simply indicate to the Chinese a further disagreement. Such an undertaking might be necessary if Modernists were rejected solely on the ground of their views. It will be clear that they are likely to be excluded from some missionary societies and they must be prepared to face misunderstanding. My own experience has been singularly happy. Regarded with some suspicion when my views were undergoing substantial modification while working partly under S.P.G. auspices in Peking, I have found a home in the American Church Mission (Protestant Episcopal) where I may speak and teach freely the faith that is in me and where wide divergencies of view are tolerated. I meet continually people whose main desire is to get on with the business of promoting the Kingdom of God in China.

Of men with modern minds who make that business their central aim there is abundant need out here. The Chinese need a religion which will help them to solve national difficulties, produce leaders, and generally help them to bear the burden and heat of the day. The chief attraction of the Modernist message will be its insistence on the Kingdom rather than on personal salvation; the challenge of the mission-field to Modernists is to put first the showing-forth of Christ in their lives. There has been a tendency, represented by the formation of the Bible Union, to split over matters which the Modernist must insist are non-essential. Difficulties arise when schemes of union come under discussion, and here again the Modernist can put first things first and insist on claiming the right hand of fellowship from those whose views may be narrow, but who are sincerely striving to win China for Christ.

It may be worth while to refer to a matter indirectly connected with the subject, because it is of some interest for the future. The Chinese are bound to ask sooner or later—some of them do ask now—where Christians stand in regard to the question of war and the problems of modern industry. Mr. Hsu has a statement in his article to the effect that 'we must not identify Christianity with the so-called Christian nations.' His meaning is not entirely clear, but there are signs that missionaries themselves are sufficiently doubtful of their case in putting forward the claims of their nations to be regarded as Christian in view of the competition of armaments and the neglect by the Churches of the industrial problem. The Fellowship of Reconciliation which has pronounced opinions on these matters is getting a foothold in China, and I cannot help feeling an impression that Modernists at home may, in the mazes of intellectualism, lose sight of the weightier matters of the law. As to war, Dr. Cadoux in his book, *The Early Christian Attitude to War*, seems to find the writings of such a prominent Modernist as Dr. Bethune-Baker unsatisfactory, while the *Modern Churchman* appears to ignore industrial problems, probably owing to want of space and inability to deal with everything.

My only point here is that these are issues of life and conduct, and it is such issues that are vital out here. It is in deal-

ing with them that one can hope for fuller co-operation and thereby find the true unity of the Spirit which recognizes many aspects of truth but one goal for all endeavour. Last summer we had at Kuling an experience which was the very antithesis of the previous year. Dr. Fosdick, whose name should be a household word among Modernists, held a packed church spellbound twice daily for a week while he preached the Gospel of the Kingdom in terms with which numbers from all missions (including many Bible Unionists) were in complete agreement. For Modernists of this type there is abundant scope out here, and it is my belief that it is men of this type who will carry the Modernist cause to victory. I have little patience personally with obscurantism, and intellectual reasoning is one of my main recreations, but for the sake of serving our generation we must bear with the Traditionalist so long as he, too, seeks the Kingdom, and we must establish our position by constructive labour for that end, leaving the Spirit of Truth to resolve our intellectual differences in the harmony of united endeavour.

THE APPEAL TO HISTORY

By the Rev. E. J. Martin, B.D., Vicar of St. John's, Rastrick, Brighouse.

ACCORDING to unfriendly critics the Liberal Churchman thinks that all that is needful is to cast Paul and the others out of the ship. On the other hand, the Liberal is apt to retort that the Conservative notion of the Christian mission is four anchors from the stern and an eternally unfulfilled wish that it was day. Now the tragic failure of religious discussion is this fatal addiction to the manufacture of phrases and debating points. So long as we are satisfied to misrepresent one another by means of dialectic, we shall increase neither knowledge nor respect. What we all need to do is to state our positions in reference to religion and analyse the process by which we have reached them—and then go on doing so. This is all the more necessary for Liberal Churchmen—let us be called Modernists if it pleases. It is all the more necessary, because

the Liberal position is so consistently misunderstood. It is commonly misrepresented in this way: those not in sympathy with the position attribute to Liberals not what Liberals have actually said or written, but deductions that may fairly or unfairly be drawn from Liberal principles. For example, a preacher before the University of Oxford in March made this statement: 'What the Modernist seeks is the still-born immortality of institutionalism.'[1] This is an adaptation of what la Berthonnière said of Greek Idealism: 'It sought that which never dies and found that which never lived.' The preacher had in mind probably the French Modernists like le Roy and especially Loisy: he apparently means that Modernism wants church and organization while repudiating the ideas which they enshrine. To this we can return. First let us notice another *obiter dictum*. In the issue of the journal reporting this sermon there occurs in a leading article a reference to 'the touching confidence that you find among theological Modernists that the final word has at last been said and all is ready for restatement.' Now the whole Liberal contention is that the final word has not been said. Accuse the Conservative if you like of a touching confidence that the final word has been said at Chalcedon, but be sure that most of us have very little confidence in any word but the Word which is the living Spirit of God.

The key to the Liberal position is that Spirit of the Lord with Whom comes Liberty. The appeal is not to institutionalism *per se*, but to the Church in so far as it is the sphere of that Free Spirit, not to the ideas petrified in organization, but to the *ethos* of our Lord which we can probably all agree the organizations were intended to perpetuate. It is so that we would use the appeal to History. We shall look for the activity of the Spirit, but we shall not expect the activity to be systematic: we shall look for the continuance of organizations, but we shall not demand that such continuance shall have virtue *per se*. We shall in fact regard it as a dangerous thing to attempt to tie the divine rigidly to the particular. We shall expect rather that the Spirit's influence, like all personal influ-

[1] Rev. G. L. Prestige, Sermon before the University of Oxford on Lady Day, 1922, reported in *Church Times*, April 7th, 1922.

ence, will be exerted not as a mechanism, but as a free (that is, self-moved) living Power.

The Catholic interpretation of History has primarily the loftiest of motives, the delineation of God's mission carried out in the world by God's ministers. In actual fact it is bound rigidly to confine the divine plan to the Catholic (strictly the Roman Catholic) Church and treat all the struggles of humanity, Protestant, mystical, barbarian, or whatever they may be, as unsorted material for the uncovenanted mercies of God. This interpretation is exactly what it claims to be, an interpretation, a view. Woven into it there is a much more suggestive and dangerous idea, the idea which Newman disentangled and set out as the Development of Christian Doctrine. This Development simply means that History is no more than the unfolding of what was contained in the supernatural germ of a primitive Christian deposit, *plus* of course the reactions of the world to the Church, the keeper of the unfolding life. According to this theory at any stage of the past the phenomena of Christian thought are steps leading from what preceded, and at any stage of the future what can happen will be implicit in what has happened already. For Newman's seven notes of true doctrinal development, preservation of type, continuity of principles, power of assimilation, logical sequence, anticipation of its future, conservative action upon its past, chronic vigour—all are less compatible with the guidance of a living Spirit than with the direction of a mechanical Spirit. According to such a view—and it is less a theory of Newman's own than an analysis of common Catholic opinion—the Spirit is no more than a piece of machinery constructed for a purpose, moved by unlimited energy, but, being a machine, able only to do that for which it is constructed. It cannot vary its activity or the direction of its motion. The personal, that is the spiritual, can only affect its working within defined limits. But 'spiritual development is not a process of passive unfolding, of which each step is rigorously determined by the preceding, but a process of active reconstruction conditioned by the chance materials furnished through the quite incalculable succession of experience.'[2] Because the traditional view confines the action of the

[2] G. Tyrrell, *Through Scylla and Charybdis.*

Spirit as it were to an assigned channel, and because it regards the Spirit's activity as the result not of vitalism, but of an elaborate though disguised mechanism, the appeal to History is often nothing but the appeal to antiquarianism; to adapt our preacher, it is the appeal from our own living present to the still-born immortality of the museum.

There is a distinction to be drawn between the system and organization which Christianity has adopted for the sake of order and the divine *ethos* which we are striving to assimilate. But if the system be regarded as the essential means of securing that the Spirit shall function, we are tied to a purely mechanical scheme. If, for example, 'No bishop, no church' be only intended to indicate the existence of a technical flaw in a scheme accepted because useful, no harm is done. But if 'No bishop, no church' is to be interpreted in any sense that implies that flaws in the mechanism can in any way hinder the work of the Spirit, or that perfection in the mechanism can increase the measure of the Spirit, then we are dangerously near realizing the meaning of sin against the Holy Ghost.

It is that way of appealing to the past which leads to spiritual paralysis. What we need is to get away from all mechanical conceptions of the Spirit's work either in the past or in the present to the sense of an absolute living Being, acting and re-acting with the life of the world. Then the spiritual progress, of which the living Spirit is the guide, will be determined not by the past or by the future. From the nature of the world these elements will come in, the formed ideas handed on from the past and the ideal motives held up by the future. But the modifying and decisive element will be the unexpected factor of the changing present, and to that the Christian society will re-act, or should re-act, as to a living force which can move in any direction, independently of any handicap or bias of the past, because it is the force of a Free Spirit.

VOLUNTARY CLERGY AND EMIGRATION

By the Rev. Roland Allen, M.A.
Author of *Missionary Methods, St. Paul's or Ours?*

LAST year about 50,000 ex-Service men were granted free passage to the Dominions: in the Empire Settlement Bill provision is made to assist the emigration of between 60,000 and 80,000 a year. Many are going unassisted: the Australian Commissioner for Migration said that in fourteen months 16,000 were assisted and 10,000 went without assistance to Australia. There is a great movement. Tens of thousands are migrating, hundreds of thousands are preparing and eager to go.

That such an exodus will put a heavy strain upon the Church no one can doubt, and the need for a bold policy is obvious. It is high time that Christian public opinion at home should be aroused not only to recognize the need for such a policy, but to formulate a policy and act on it. For we know well by experience what will happen unless the Church at home faces the difficulty and prepares to meet it before it is upon her. Unless she takes action betimes, in a few years for a large number of these people the opportunity will be lost.

I say that we know by experience what will happen. These people will go abroad persuaded that for all organized religious life they must be provided with paid professional clergy, and that none but these professional clergy can administer the Sacraments duly, hold services, or expound the Scriptures. For some years at least they will be engaged in making good their own economic position in the new country. They will be widely scattered in small groups; they will not be able to find clergy, nor to support men who have no other means of livelihood than the clerical profession. Dependent upon and unable to obtain a professional clergy to conduct their services and give religious instruction to their children, what will happen? Their children will die unbaptized, or grow up untaught, and great

numbers of them will learn to live without any religion. Very soon there will go up a great howl of entreaty that we should send out clergy to minister to these people, and we shall not be able to send the clergy. That is what has happened in the past, that is what will happen again, unless we take steps to avert it. We all know the sort of appeals which have been made to us in the past; we all know the sort of response which has been made to those appeals. We all know that it is absolutely impossible that we should be able to send clergy from home in anything like sufficient numbers to supply the need. We all know that the Church in the Dominions cannot multiply in a year or two its clergy many times over in order to meet the needs of a great influx of population from these islands. Even a child could calculate that to provide paid professional clergy for these people in the early years of their settlement is impossible, and every thoughtful man knows that to fail to provide clergy in the early years of settlement means that if the clergy arrive later they will arrive too late, and that while they tarry the devout will have been starving and growing cold, and the indifferent will have grown more indifferent, and recovery will be a matter of great difficulty. There is not a shadow of excuse for us, if we simply drift along and refuse to recognize the necessity for a bold policy.

Seeing that the provision of paid professional clergy is out of the question, there is only one alternative possible, and that is the admission of voluntary clergy. By voluntary clergy I mean men in full Orders who maintain themselves by their own trade, profession, or other means of livelihood, and minister to their fellows for the love of God. We ought to begin now to seek out in every little group of our fellow-countrymen all over the world, and at home amongst all those who are preparing to emigrate, good, devout men respected by their neighbours, and exhort, command, I had almost said compel, them to be ordained, pointing out to them the gravity of the loss when a community is cut off from all organized Church-life.

Of those who emigrate from these shores the great majority are nominally members of the Church of England, and amongst them there are always a considerable number of people

who have been devout communicants and who would only unwillingly find themselves in a situation where they would be deprived of the Sacraments: people who, if they were authorized to minister to their families and to others, would both save themselves and those who heard them.

If once we could open this door and make Church-people familiar with the idea that it is possible for a man who earns his own living to be a priest, is it possible to doubt that we should meet the most serious necessities of the case? Christians scattered in little groups all over the world would no longer be able to send up that bitter cry which already has been ringing in our ears so tragically all these years; if they did, the answer would be clear: You can have sacraments, you can have priests. If you are deprived of them, it is because you will to be deprived of them. No tradition now stands in your way. If prejudice stands in your way, it is your own prejudice; if sloth hinders, it is your own sloth; if diffidence makes you hesitate, it is your own diffidence, and that a false diffidence. The Sacraments were ordained for Christian men. The organization of the Church is for her children, not her children for the organization. The door is open.

Not only would the needs of many small groups be speedily met in this way, but in some cases the ordination of these men would set free more fully-trained men of the paid professional class to itinerate amongst those who had no local priests, or to do a new work, a work of the utmost importance and gravity. It would set them free to visit, support, advise, instruct, encourage the unpaid clergy.

There is no question that such action would be apostolic in character; there is no doubt that there is abundant precedent for it in the history of the early Church; but there is no doubt also that there is an old-established tradition and a considerable prejudice against it.

It is obvious that to meet the situation which I have described, by calling in the assistance of voluntary clergy, would involve the ordination of very large numbers of men; it would involve the ordination of men with a very different training and education from that with which we are familiar; it would involve the admission of large numbers of men from all classes

of the population; it would involve the ordination of men o mature age; and in all these ways it would affect very seriousl our conception of the relation of the clergy to the laity, an would run counter to our inherited preconceptions and preju dices.

(1) We have been accustomed to look upon the clergy as special and distinct class in the community, comparatively smal in numbers, an oligarchy in fact in the Church. Any grea increase in its numbers would alter at once the relation betwee the laity and the clergy by the mere fact that the familiar pro portions would be upset; and to many minds that immediatel suggests the idea that the priesthood would be in some sor degraded and in a way made cheap.

(2) We have of late been moving steadily in the direction o thinking more and more of the clerical office as a highly specialised profession, for the efficient practice of which a lon and highly-specialized training is necessary, and we have fo very many years been accustomed to think of education in peculiarly narrow sense, and to confine the word almost entirel to literary acquirements, and in the case of the clergy to literar knowledge of a somewhat narrow and professional literature The admission, then, of large numbers of men who had not ha this particular type of education inevitably suggests to man minds the idea that the new clergy would be uneducated me and therefore of a low type.

(3) We have been accustomed for many years to draw ou clergy almost entirely from one class of the population. It i true that of late there has been a strong tendency to open th door to ordination to men of what our forefathers called 'th lower classes'; but so far, owing to the fact of our insistenc upon the specialized education and the fact that the clerg formed a special class in the Church, the only apparent resu has been that those who entered that class ceased to belong t the class from which they originally sprang, and adopted th habits of thought and life of the class which they joined, retai ing only some idiosyncracies which are not always an assistan to them in their work. The clerical class remains, as it wer a caste in the community with very strong caste instincts. Th

admission, then, of very large numbers of men of all classes who had not had the training which removes the man from his natural class, but leaves him in it, might certainly arouse strong caste prejudice.

(4) We have been accustomed for many years to recruit the clergy almost entirely from the very young, and if anything we incline more and more to take children, or very young men, because they can more easily receive that special literary education, and that special social and ecclesiastical stamp, which seem to us proper for a cleric; but the voluntary clergy would probably be for the most part men of mature age, and therefore less malleable.

All these and other such ideas are very natural to us in England, and they unquestionably, separately or together, raise a very serious barrier in the way of the admission of voluntary clergy in this country. And unhappily a prejudice at home, and the influence of practice at home, is not only a barrier at home, but creates a barrier abroad to a policy which seems to me to be absolutely essential, if great numbers of people are not to be lost. Yet when I consider those changes in our practice which are obviously involved in the admission of voluntary clergy, some of them seem to me even in England to have some advantages.

(1) The ordination of large numbers of men would alter the proportion of the clergy viewed as a separate class in relation to the laity, and might seem to undermine the status of the clerical profession; on the other hand it is quite possible, if not quite certain, that this would have some very beneficial results. There are heard not a few voices to-day deploring the sharp distinction between the clergy and the laity. If we think simply of the faithful laity, the church-goers and communicants, the distinction may seem harmless, if not beneficial; but if we think of the great mass of men outside who live their lives untouched by the Church and look upon the clergy as a class with whom they have very little in common, it might well be that the presence of clergy in their midst, engaged in their everyday work, would bring home to them a new conception of the relation between religion and everyday life; for they would see

that the Church as represented by her ministers was really in their midst, and they would not easily escape from that influence. It might indeed do a great deal to bring organized religion once more into the heart and life of the people.

(2) It is true no doubt that many of the voluntary clergy would not have had the training and education which is now given to the clergy as a separate class; but we are learning every day now, slowly indeed but surely, that education is something far wider than we thought a few years ago, that literary education is only one side of the education of a man, and that many men are very highly educated in the real sense of the word, whose literary education has been sadly small. In saying this I am not minimizing the importance of literary education: I am simply asserting the importance of education which is not literary, an education of character which is derived from experience of life. Now there is no doubt that in our selection of candidates for the ministry we have over-emphasized the importance of the literary education, and under-estimated the importance of the education which comes from the experience of life. We have made literary knowledge the chief test of candidates for ordination, and have taken it for granted that they would acquire that education which comes from the experience of life after ordination. But unfortunately the cleric, as a member of the clerical order, does not really share the common life of men, and does not gain that experience which for good or for evil is there; for he lives, for the most part, in an atmosphere, and under conditions, which are not the common experience of the great mass of men. It might well be argued that it would be no small advantage to the Church if a considerable proportion of her clergy, living in the common atmosphere and sharing the common toil and the common experience, were really educated in this sense. The other day a friend of mine, who has been engaged for many years in what is called 'religious work,' found himself suddenly thrown into the common market; and there can be no doubt that that experience profoundly affected his whole conception of the relation of religion to daily life. Things which he had taken for granted were suddenly put to a new test, and he went through a whole course of religious education of a profoundly vital character in a few

weeks. It is hard to believe that if a proportion of our clergy received that education both before and after ordination, it would not be a real advantage to the whole Church.

(3) Again, that the clergy should not only spring from, but be in and of every class would certainly not be wholly an evil. It is easy to see the disadvantages of taking clergy *from* all classes, and it is that which is generally meant when modern reformers talk of opening the door to men of every class; but it is quite a different matter to have clergy *in* all classes, and it is that conception which we must keep clear in mind when we talk about voluntary clergy.

(4) Finally, the voluntary clergy would be men for the most part of mature age. They would generally be ordained because they had approved themselves, and proved the value of their religion in the struggle of life. They would all be educated men in the wide sense of the word education: they would be men of religious experience more than men of theological knowledge. And yet we must not forget how speedily men of experience can acquire a knowledge of some new science when they find themselves in a position of responsibility in which a knowledge of that science is necessary. Many men of mature age, when they met the responsibility of the priesthood would in a year or two become as good theologians as many, if not the majority, of the young students who are 'turned out' by the theological colleges. And we must not forget that most men now have a literary education which would have been the envy of the great mass of the clergy in earlier ages. And further, into the ordination of these men there would enter a consideration, the absence of which is perhaps the greatest blot on our present ordination system. One of the Pauline requirements for the ministry was that the ordinand should be a man held in respect by those outside the Church.

Now all that we require is the absence of any direct objection on the part of the faithful. That a man is a 'sawny' is no bar to his ordination. But to the ordination of voluntary clergy it would be a very serious bar. Men to be ordained under those conditions which I have sketched, unless they were men of character and experience, respected by their neighbours

as capable men, would be of very little use; and bishops would be driven to consider very seriously when they were ordaining voluntary clergy whether the candidates proposed to them were men of character who held the respect of their neighbours. Indeed, it would be just because men had that character and that respect that bishops would want to ordain them. They would not be the weaklings who failed, but the men who were 'making good,' who would be ordained. I find it impossible to believe that the ordination of such men, even if mistakes were occasionally made and the wrong man ordained, would not, on the whole, immensely strengthen the Church. Even if possible difficulties and dangers are painted in the darkest colours, it seems to me that they weigh no more than the light dust in the balance compared with the heavy consequences which inevitably ensue when Christians are cut off from the means of grace, and from all organized Church life.

TWO NOTES ON THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ATHANASIUS

By the Rev. C. E. Raven, B.D., Editor of the *Challenge*, and sometime Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

DR. RASHDALL'S very able survey of the Christology of Athanasius is probably sufficient to convince any impartial reader that the great Bishop was a thorough Apollinarian. Students of the period, and any who still have doubts on the subject, may perhaps be interested in the two following points, neither of which, so far as I am aware, has been hitherto noted.

I. *Athanasius and the Arians.*

Perhaps the clearest proof of the Apollinarianism of Athanasius is supplied by his attitude towards the Arians. Arianism was, as its earliest documents, the *Letter of Alexander* and the *Thalia* of Arius, reveal, originally based upon an argument

from Christology. Accepting the belief established by the sophist, Malchion, against Paul of Samosata that Christ differed from mankind because in Him the Logos took the place of a human soul, Arius argued that Christ was the Logos (otherwise He would be simply an inspired man as Paul taught); that Christ was capable of change, as the Scripture plainly showed; that therefore the Logos was capable of change and on that account inferior to the changeless Father. In answering this syllogism, it was possible for the orthodox to attack either the major premiss and develop a doctrine of the human soul in Christ, or the minor premiss and explain that the human growth and change in Christ were unreal. The former method is obviously that which later Catholicism would have followed: but at the time the only champion of Nicea to adopt it was the Bishop of Antioch, Eustathius, a great but almost forgotten teacher whom Chrysostom reckons a martyr in will if not in deed, and who was the true founder of the Antiochene school of theology, the school from which came the sole adequate reply to Apollinarius. Eustathius, as the scanty fragments of his work proves,[1] attacked the Arian denial of a human soul to Christ: but in doing so he stood alone. The Alexandrians, and Athanasius among them, dared not follow him: for to them the admission of a human soul meant the revival of the heresy of Paul of Samosata. They were forced back, therefore, upon an attack upon the minor premiss, and exercised their ingenuity upon attempts to eliminate from the Gospels the plain proofs of our Lord's humanity. Dr. Rashdall has shown how this contention was elaborated in the Orations against the Arians. But in fact during the earlier stages of the controversy the ground was shifted by common consent from Christology to the doctrine of the Trinity: for Alexander had shown that the belief that Christ was capable of change was a return 'to the old heresy of Ebion and Artemas, Paul of Samosata and Lucian'; and Arius was fighting not for Arianism, but for his own recognition as orthodox, and was therefore compelled to drop the use of an argument which, however cogent, might conflict with his chance of securing such recognition. It was only in the second stage of the controversy that Eunomius, the ablest and most fearless

[1] *Cf.* especially fragment of the *De Anima* in Theodoret *Dial* III. p. 156.

of the Arians, returned to Christology and reintroduced the syllogism with which the controversy had started.

My point is that if Athanasius had not been an Apollinarian he could have smashed the Arian case by attacking the denial of a human soul to Christ which was essential to it.

II. *Athanasius and Apollinarius.*

Traditionalists who deny the Apollinarianism of Athanasius do so on two grounds: first the belief that the Father of Orthodoxy could not have shared the opinions of a heretic, and secondly the belief that the later writings of the great Alexandrian contain attacks upon Apollinarius. The first of these is unimportant. The second deserves study.

The writings alleged to deal with this matter are the two books against Apollinarius and the *Ad Epictetum*. It is true that the genuineness of the two former is not now defended by any competent scholar, and that the latter has in reality nothing whatever to do with Apollinarianism; but the *Ad Epictetum* is so famous and has for so long been associated with the heretic that even those who admit its irrelevance cannot eradicate the prejudice against admitting any close agreement between the Bishops of Alexandria and of Laodicea.

And yet the *Ad Epictetum* was actually sent in draft to Apollinarius by its author for his criticism and approval before publication. We still have preserved by Leontius[2] fragments of the letter in which Apollinarius returns it to Sarapion, the Bishop of Thmuis, who during Athanasius' third exile acted as his agent in Egypt. In this letter he quotes with whole-hearted repudiation the chief contention attacked in the *Ad Epictetum*, and after a warm commendation of 'my Lord's letter directed to Corinth' suggests certain amendments which appear to have been incorporated in the final text. Voisin, one of the few scholars who have recognized this fact, in his *L'Apollinarisme*[3] attempts to explain it on the theory that the *Ad Epictetum* was sent to Laodicea to test the orthodoxy of the bishop—as if Apollinarius, 'the ever-beloved of the blessed Father Athanasius,' as even Epiphanius[4], that scourge of the heretics, calls

[2] *Adv. Fraudes* 129 and 138, in Leitzmann *Apollinaris* pp. 253, 254.
[3] Pp. 64, 66. [4] *Haer.* LXXVII.

him, would have ventured to suggest alterations or assume the position of a recognized expert under such circumstances.

The probable reason for the neglect of this important piece of evidence is the failure to date the *Ad Epictetum* correctly. Dr. Rashdall follows tradition, in this case a tradition with no evidence to support it, in assigning the letter to 371, a date selected by those who thought that it was directed against Apollinarianism. As a matter of fact the allusions to the 'assembling of diverse synods'[5] and the description of the condemnation by them of the Arians, Auxentius, Ursacius, Valens and Gaius, plainly refer to the events narrated in almost identical terms in the *De Synodis*, 9—11, that is to the meetings culminating in the Council of Ariminum in 359. There is not a word in the *Ad Epictetum* inconsistent with this date, and it is in harmony with the fact already noted that Apollinarius' comment on it was sent to Sarapion and that therefore presumably Athanasius was still in exile.

Finally even in the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, the letter of the Council of 362, there is nothing which Apollinarius cannot accept if he is allowed to put his own, and Athanasius', interpretation upon the words. For there is preserved also by Leontius[6] a letter from Apollinarius to certain bishops exiled in 374, after Athanasius' death, to Diocaesarea, in which the future heresiarch, now expressly challenged to give his views, declares that the trouble then arising about the Incarnation is not of his making, and quotes at length and with complete approval the crucial clauses of the *Tome*,[7] 'The Saviour had not a body without a soul, nor without sense-perceptions, nor without intelligence,' &c. By this time Apollinarius' orthodoxy was probably becoming suspect, but his letter rings true, and he could not have made in it the reference to 'the blessed bishop Athanasius, who knew that I was in harmony with his doctrine and agreed with him in all respects' if the *Tome* had marked any real change of attitude towards the humanity of Christ.

[5] §1. [6] l.c. 146, l.c. p. 255. [7] §7.

IN MEMORIAM

JOHN EDWARD MERCER.

The death of Bishop Mercer at the comparatively early age of 66 is a serious loss to the cause of Modernism in the Church of England. He was unequivocally a theological liberal; on this point he never sought to conceal or obscure his attitude. Yet he was conspicuously free from those particular weaknesses and failings which are generally regarded as characteristic of liberals; he was neither pedantic, nor academic, nor in any sense 'un-human.' In his own person he stood as a living refutation of the libel that the modernist is incapable of securing the confidence and affection of the 'simple believer.'

Bishop Mercer's work as a parish clergyman for twenty years at Newton Heath and Gorton, Manchester, is still remembered; it 'lingers as a memory of a strong man, gifted in preaching and organisation,' as the Vicar of an important Manchester parish writes to us. Promotion came in 1902, when he was appointed to the see of Tasmania, where he remained for twelve years, and where he proved himself to be the type of man that our colonists understand and trust. He won the respect not only of churchpeople, but of some elements of the community whom his official position alone would have done nothing to conciliate. Without being a 'court-chaplain to King Demos,' he won the confidence and respect of the Labour Unions. He was notably simple and unconventional in his manner, treated all alike, and was no respecter of persons.

On returning to England in 1914, he was appointed to a residentiary canonry at Chester, where he gave much help to Bishop Jayne, whose health failed somewhat towards the end of his tenure of office. It was at this period of his career that the present writer came into contact with him, and is able strongly to support the verdict of a country Vicar in the Chester diocese, who said: 'His confirmation addresses were excellent—he never talked rot.' Those addresses were indeed the very best of their kind that the present writer has ever listened to; in particular, one on the hymn, 'Our blest Redeemer . . ,' delivered, if we recollect rightly, in 1917, he remembers very clearly, and the impression that it made on the young people and their parents. And this is not a point of secondary importance, but a fact of great significance; for here was a man who as a metaphysician had very few superiors in Anglican orders, and was in touch with all the most recent results of scientific research, who yet was able to speak to the hearts and understandings of simple believers without bowing in the slightest degree to the Rimmon of a conventional traditionalism. He was able to do this because, scientist and philosopher as he was, he understood the mind and imagination of a child, and had a good deal of the child about him.

This leads naturally to Bishop Mercer's work as a popular interpreter of modern science and philosophy. He was an ardent student of physics and biology, and an industrious and prolific writer on these subjects in their bearing upon ideals of human faith and conduct, especially in his later years, for with him to live was to learn. The titles of some of his better known books indicate the scope and nature of his work: 'The Science of Life and the Larger Hope,' 'The Problem of Creation,' 'Some

Wonders of Matter,' 'Why do we Die?' 'Alchemy: Its Science and Romance.'

Unhappily, some of the clergy were inclined to be suspicious of one who dispensed with clerical mannerisms and conventional modes of expression; and his churchmanship was suspect. And it must be admitted that he regarded the Church as existing, not for its own sake nor even for the sake of the clergy, but for the sake of mankind. It was an instrument for the advancement of the Kingdom of God. The Bishop was really a Christian Humanist, and felt a little uncomfortable in the presence of those who live among the petty pieties of ecclesiasticism. Once when asked to conduct a quiet day for the clergy, he declined, feeling, as he remarked, that 'it was not quite in his line'; yet he afterwards debated whether he had been right. And indeed, he was quite capable of speaking movingly on religious matters, for there was an atmosphere of reality and sincerity in his utterances.

With regard to his opinions, though he know well enough how to be silent, yet no one was ever left in the least doubt where he stood. Whether he was advocating some measure of social reform, or attacking the drink traffic, or upholding the unpopular cause of theological liberalism among the clergy, he acted and spoke without acerbity, but without ambiguity. Perhaps clearness of mind gave him clearness of purpose, but he saw and acted straight. This quality is too rare among public men; the difficulties of their position are so great. Yet when an instance of it is found we may admire it and be grateful.

Horatio observes of Hamlet's father that he was 'a very noble king'; but Hamlet corrects him and says: 'He was a *man* . . .' John Edward Mercer was a bishop, and a good bishop; but he was, if possible, something more—he was a man.

A member of the Churchmen's Union for many years, Bishop Mercer read a paper at the Girton Conference of 1917, and had accepted the Committee's invitation to read a paper at the Conference to be held at Somerville College, Oxford, this year. The first article from an episcopal pen to appear in the *Modern Churchman* was contributed by him. When sending it in, with characteristic humility, he wrote:

'I do not know that it is worthy of publication, but I should like to think that at least one bishop has contributed an article to your magazine.'

J.C.H.

WILLIAM ALBAN CUNNINGHAM-CRAIG.

To those who knew Cunningham-Craig at his work at St. Sepulchre's, Holborn, a short note on his Oxford time in the early nineties will not be amiss. It has been remarked that there are two conspicuous types of Scotsmen, very dissimilar; one is dour and silent, and gives out as little as possible, if there is anything to give; the other is genial, even exuberant, never afraid of his company, and lets himself go. Craig was of this latter kind. There is possibly a strain of Celtic to account for it. The Englishman is apt at first to put it down as trifling, and generally ends by discovering in it a central dignity and an implicit strength. Craig's College friends saw little change in him as time went by: to call at his house was much the same thing as it once was to drop in at his rooms. There he was, first or last, discharging his fireworks, watching the effect of his epigrams, and boyishly delighted if they

told, with a manner of delivering them that came to him as a born speaker and debater. His intellectual life was peculiarly vivid, and he dashed and coruscated at sharp angles into his subject, enjoying himself thoroughly, and thoroughly antagonising, perhaps, whoever heard him with too much or too little seriousness. For all this was the superficial play of a mind most earnestly absorbed in the difficulties and the certainties of the Christian faith; and once a practical question arose—a matter of right or wrong, of prudent or imprudent—the sports and gambols subsided, and the speculator was succeeded by a very shrewd man, at once cautious and forthright, with both feet on the ground.

The three men who seemed to his friends to have most to do with the moulding of his mind at Oxford, were Edward Caird, William Wallace, and Sidney Ball of St. John's. Caird had taught him at Glasgow, became Master of Balliol almost as soon as Craig began with Greats, and lectured to large crowds in Balliol Hall. At the same time Wallace was drawing a devoted audience to his Professorial discourses in the Schools. Craig, to whom philosophy was his native land, hung on the lips of these teachers, and mixed a personal affection in his discipleship that must have pleased them, had they known of it. Perhaps it was they principally who gave or confirmed his characteristic union of the critical and the affirmative minds. Ball was the father of his political radicalism, and of much of what may be called his intellectual manner. To the young idealist of those years Joseph Chamberlain and the new Imperialism were the national evils, and Socialism the 'engine at the door.' Ball, one of the most radiant and large-hearted of men, with a mind whose determinateness was apt to be masked by its generosities, was the principal influence that fostered the socialism and radicalism (they were not so very distinguishable) that struck root at Oxford. He was no pure and mere enthusiast, but a man of affairs, and wise in human nature; and his rational and humorous idealism found a ready response in his pupil Craig, as well as his candour and curiosity, and his lover-like pursuit of epigrams and consummate sayings. With what fire did Craig dart upon any solid thought if he could espy it dressed in the daring and the strange! He had a vast relish for current literature with that quality in it. To think of him as he then was is to think of his quotations and recitations, and especially perhaps of his rendering of that lurid presentment of a startling truth in Kipling's ballad of *Tomlinson*,—'Now Tomlinson gave up the ghost in his house in Berkeley Square.'

There are people, possibly, to whom he might seem at times to be flippant. But the mere epigrammatist will soon perish in his cleverness. Craig has a shrine in the memories of his friends, and lived a noble and inspiring life, because his intellectual powers were fed by a natural love of truth, a natural honesty, a warm and brave heart, and a fundamental devoutness. Much of his experience was hard and sorrowful, but the trial only tempered the good steel. It will be a sad day for our Church when men like him are prevented, or much discouraged from entering her ministry, because they cannot be quiet, but hold their faith in the spirit of the saying that Sidney Ball was always repeating: *ὁ δ' ἀνεξέταστος βίος οὐ βιωτὸς ἀνθρώπῳ.*

A.M.D.H.

BOOK NOTICES

THE GREATEST NEED OF THE CHURCH*

The Dean of Carlisle has helped the Modernist cause by preparing this small volume for the Press. It consists of his Cambridge Conference paper, 'Christ as Logos and Son of God,' two sermons preached in Carlisle Cathedral shortly after the Conference on 'The Divinity of Christ' and 'The Word of God,' and his Birmingham Church Conference sermon on 'The Greatest Need of the Church.' The Dean's Cambridge paper is familiar to our readers, but the two sermons throw a valuable light on certain statements in it, and should be read by all who are not entirely satisfied by that paper and would like a fuller statement of the Dean's belief in the Incarnation. What need there was for the Dean's utterance has been shown in many ways, and not least by the general weakness and inconsistency of the attacks to which it has been subjected.

The title of the Birmingham Conference Sermon suggests many answers. Some would reply the greatest need of the Church is more money; others disestablishment; others rigorous traditional orthodoxy; others a stronger sense of fellowship; others greater self-sacrifice; others more diocesan bishops; others the expulsion of Modernists. Dean Rashdall's answer is this :—

> 'I do not hesitate to say that one of the greatest needs—perhaps the greatest need—of the Church to-day is an improvement in the education of the clergy, and a changed attitude towards intellectual questions on the part, not only of the clergy, but of the religious laity. Without that, not all the devotion of the laborious parochial clergy, not all the subscriptions of the benevolent laity, not all the new organizations and machineries—Assemblies, Finance Boards, new dioceses, and the rest—will avail to enable the Church to hold its own and do its work in the world of to-day' (pp. 78-79).

In dealing with this need Dr. Rashdall cites some significant words of Bishop Neville Talbot of Pretoria, formerly Assistant-Chaplain-General :—

> 'There is a great danger to-day in the exaltation of religious devotion and activity over love of the truth. During the last sixty years so much of the best and most intense achievements, whether Evangelical or Catholic, have been reared on a basis of reactionary thought' (pp. 90-91). H.D.A.M.

THE MODERNISM OF BISHOP GORE.

In the January number of the *Modern Churchman,* Dr. Tollinton reviewed Dr. Gore's *Belief in God* from the standpoint of the theological scholar. Perhaps the impressions of an uninitiated layman may be a useful supplement?

Dr. Gore apparently welcomes the analysis of our historic statements of Christian history and belief. He recommends (p. 2) an 'equally frank cross-questioning of traditional religious beliefs and of the current dogmas of the contemporary intellectual world.' He thoroughly approves 'this

* *Jesus, Human and Divine,* by HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.D.; pub. Andrew Melrose (1922); price 3/6 net.

process of fundamental reconstruction of religious beliefs' (p. 4). He says truly that 'religion is for common men. It is in the region of common reason, at least as much as in the circles of specialized study, that it must be judged' (p. 27), and, referring to the times of John Stuart Mill, he admits that 'it must be recognised that the current tradition of orthodox Protestantism had offended, at certain points even violently, the real conscience of men' (p. 20). Dr. Gore admits that the statements that satisfied the generation of Paley are inadequate now, and declares that 'we shall not for a moment be so foolish as to entertain the idea of exempting the sacred documents of Christianity from the severest and freest criticism' (p. 176).

Dr. Gore proceeds himself to analyse the Old and New Testaments. Dealing with the Old Testament he declares frankly that 'Moses certainly did not write the Pentateuch, nor did he write all that is there ascribed to him. Again, the Psalms as a whole were ascribed to David, but only a very small portion of them can have been actually of his authorship,' and so on (p. 15). He admits that the 'ordinary man' has the impression that 'the Tower of Babel was not a true account of the origin of languages; many things written in the Bible did not actually happen—could not indeed have happened as it described' (p. 16). Then, dealing with the extreme critics of Old Testament documents who take this view and seek no further—thanks usually to the absence of Broad teachers—he truly says that these 'people did not ask themselves whether poetry and drama and legend and myth have not in other nations proved to be as potent vehicles of truth as historical fact'' (p. 16). Exactly, and this is precisely the position, as I understand it, of Broad Churchmen. Dr. Gore and 'Modernists' are apparently agreed that 'the very earthly origins of Hebrew prophecy' do not discredit it (p. 96), and all that Broad Churchmen are demanding is the right, as Churchmen, to enquire into all origins and to re-state the fundamental truths in language that is intelligible to people to-day. 'Every man,' says Dr. Gore (p. 106) 'must draw his own conclusion as to the nature or source of the prophets' inspiration,' and so on. So far, at any rate, as the Old Testament is concerned, it seems to me that there is no difference, far less any cause for dispute, between the positions of Dr. Gore and of Broad Churchmen.

Then as to the documents of the New Testament, Dr. Gore writes frankly (p. 174) of 'the substantial historical truth of the Gospels—not their critical infallibility, but their substantial trustworthiness.' What more do Broad Churchmen claim? Dr. Gore recognises 'that there is in Christian scriptures and creeds a great deal of language, about things which lie outside our possible experience, which is necessarily symbolic' (p. 180), and he admits that 'certainly Church teachers frankly recognised that "He sitteth on the right hand of God" was a symbolic statement and not a literal truth' (p. 179). Then as to the earliest gospel, he admits that it was written not earlier than 65 A.D., and that Mark wrote mainly from accounts received from Peter (p. 191). Dr. Gore even admits quite frankly that Mark may have made mistakes in his account. Thus:—

> 'Suppose that beside Peter's story of the feeding of the five thousand, Mark heard another story of a miraculous feeding, in which the numbers were four thousand instead of five thousand, and seven loaves instead of five, and mistook it for a similar incident, and so gave us an account of two events when really there was but one, this would make no material difference to us. We are asking not for infallibility, but for quite trustworthy history' (p. 191).

This is an admission of very real importance to Broad Churchmen, all of whom would agree to this statement. But it is an admission of their fundamental justification, namely that the authors of the gospels were fallible, and that their work need not be accepted as inspired in every detail. Such an admission justifies Broad Churchmen in sometimes searching for an explanation of events in our Lord's life which is different from the explanation given in the gospels, having regard to our greater knowledge of the laws of science and evidence.

Then as to Luke, Dr. Gore admits (p. 198) that 'there is no claim made by Luke to special inspiration, but only a claim to have had the fullest opportunity of gathering information, and to have taken advantage of it so as to be able to produce an accurate narative.' Again Broad Churchmen would agree. Further, Dr. Gore says that Luke's narrative is 'coloured by his disposition, what is apparent' (p. 200). Writing of Matthew, Dr. Gore says (p. 203) that 'in some three cases we have to admit that prophecies from the Old Testament have been allowed to modify the details of the narrative, and in connection with our Lord's death and burial the author introduces material which it is difficult to believe to be historical.' These are startling admissions indeed. Dr. Gore would say that, even so, there is no diminution of the value of the gospel. Broad Churchmen would fully agree, and they say the same after all their own criticism and enquiry. Our Lord's life and work remain, and their appeal is all the more powerful when the explanations given by His chroniclers are understood in their true light. One important mission of the Broad Churchman I regard to be to free the picture of our Lord from the limitations and mistakes of the gospel writers and the dogmatists of later ages.

Surely, if Mark and Matthew can have made mistakes, and if Luke was not 'specially inspired,' then Dr. Gore and Broad Churchmen are really, though Dr. Gore does not realise it, at one in believing these invaluable records to have been the work of human beings, endowed with all the human limitations of their time. The Broad Churchman differs from Dr. Gore—the difference seems to me to be one of degree rather than of principle—in believing that, this being so, many of the interpretations placed by the synoptists upon events as they heard of them are coloured, not only by their 'disposition,' but by the ideas and scientific ignorance then prevailing. In those days science was in its infancy, as psychic knowledge still is to-day. If the Gospel stories were the work of men, and were not verbally inspired, is it strange that miraculous interpretations were placed upon many of our Lord's achievements? Dr. Gore admits (p. 205) that in those times '"Miracles," such as are commonly recorded in the *Gospels* and *Acts*, were also reported in the Roman Empire in connection with sacred shrines and persons.' Miracle is often but an explanation of something that the writer does not understand. Admit that the Gospel writers were human in all their work, then their miraculous explanations—derived mainly, be is remembered, on Dr. Gore's own showing, at second hand—are easily intelligible.

I can understand the man who, believing in the textual inspiration of the Gospels, calls out for the proscription of the Broad Churchman. But such a man must proscribe Dr. Gore, too. If Dr. Gore's book is 'orthodox,' what justification can there be for attempts to eject from the Church of England those who do not regard a literal acceptance of the interpretations of the Gospel writers as 'conditions precedent' to membership of our Church? It seems to me that the difference between Dr. Gore and Broad Churchmen is purely one of degree, and that there

is no reason whatever why they should not work in peace and harmony together as loyal members of the broadest of all Churches.

It may sound paradoxical to claim Dr. Gore as being to-day a Modernist, but a Modernist he really is; had his views been held by an ex-bishop in days gone by, they would have led to the stake. I rejoice at Dr. Gore's broad views, and acknowledge his obvious honesty of mind, though I could wish that his views were broader still. But his views are extraordinarily different from the conventional teaching of 'orthodox' clergymen, teaching which made me, for one, revolt—and indulge in the spirit of intellectual superiority and arrogance, so typical of this generation—until contact with the leaders of the Churchmen's Union restored my enthusiasm for our national Church.

If Broad Churchmen are to be attacked because their theology is progressive and not within the letter of ecclesiastical codes of bygone centuries, then, surely, Dr. Gore, and plenty of other 'orthodox' religious leaders, should share the ecclesiastical dock with them. The public ought to be informed of the lengths that Dr. Gore is prepared to go, and then, if there is to be a proscription of the spirit of reverent enquiry and re-interpretation, all enquirers should be treated alike. Those who want the Church of England to be bound hand and foot by the literal wording and explanations of the past should assail Dr. Gore as well as the Principal of Ripon Hall; they should also explain how by such methods they propose to remedy the present alienation of the majority of the community from membership of the Christian Churches.

CLAUD MULLINS.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.*

We often wonder why so many books are written on Biblical subjects by writers who have no worthy contribution to make. Dr. Harrison's book on the Pastoral Epistles is in another class. An enormous amount of patient investigation and no little thought and ingenuity have gone to the making of it, and no future student of the Pastoral Epistles will be able to ignore the results of Dr. Harrison's research.

Many who accept as genuine ten of the epistles attributed to St. Paul in the New Testament, hesitate to accept the Pastoral Epistles as his. This is not because they do not value the Pastoral Epistles, but because the historical background, doctrinal teaching, literary style, and vocabulary of the epistles to Titus and Timothy differ from those of the great Pauline epistles. It seems possible to explain all these difficulties, with the exception of the vocabulary, in such a way as not to exclude the Pauline authorship. The vocabulary is the *crux*, and so it is to the vocabulary that Dr. Harrison especially addresses himself. Hitherto critics have been content to show that the vocabulary is not Pauline: Dr. Harrison, however, passes beyond the negative position: he makes it clear that the non-Pauline portion of the vocabulary is characteristic of ecclesiastical writers in the first half of the second century, and that the large number of characteristic Pauline words conspicuously absent from the Pastorals are also conspicuously absent from the early Fathers and Apologists.

* *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, by P. N. HARRISON, D.D.; pub. by Oxford University Press (1921); price 12/-.

This conclusion seems to point clearly to the Pastorals as a whole being post-Pauline. But although later than St. Paul they still would appear to be earlier than Ignatius (martyred about 115 A.D.), for they know nothing of a local monarchical episcopate such as existed in Syria and Asia Minor when the Ignatian epistles were written.

But although Dr. Harrison does not regard the Pastoral Epistles as Pauline, he does regard them as containing *five* genuine Pauline notes or brief letters addressed by the Apostle on various occasions to Titus and Timothy. The most important of these is his last letter to Timothy (portions of which are preserved in II Tim. i. 16-18, III of 10*f*. iv. 1, 6-8, 18*b*-22*a*). This is St. Paul's testament and swan-song, and we are glad that critical research does not deprive us of this inspiring and heroic apostolic utterance.

Plain men may well ask, Why trouble about such questions as the authorship and date of these three epistles? The answer is that it is important to get as true a view as possible of the date and origin of the books of the New Testament, especially for the purpose of tracing the source and development of Christian doctrine and institutions. To arrive at the truth here is to have secured one important test by which to try what is essential and what is non-essential in the Christian Religion.

H.D.A.M.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.*

Dr. Westcott in the introduction to his famous commentary on St. John's Gospel adduced impressive evidence in favour of the author being a Jew, and moreover a Jew of Palestine. The research recorded in Professor Burney's recent learned volume supports Westcott (who possessed some of that Semitic Scholarship which Professor Burney desires in a New Testament scholar) by proving that the author of the Fourth Gospel was an Aramaic speaking Jew, thoroughly familiar with Rabbinical speculation, and one who knew his Scriptures in the Hebrew. Dr. Burney further contends that the Fourth Gospel is a 'virtual translation,' if not an 'actual translation' from the Aramaic. He also claims that his conclusions dispose of 'the figment of Alexandrine influence upon the author,' because his Logos-doctrine is the development of conceptions enshrined in the Targums and not derived from Philo.

It seems to us exceedingly difficult to give a clear verdict in favour of an Aramaic original of the Fourth Gospel, which is the crucial point in Dr. Burney's book. The evidence in support of an Aramaic original is greatly weakened by the four following considerations: (*a*) the Semitic character of Hellenistic Greek, upon which all modern students (*e.g.* Moulton, Deissmann) of that dialect insist; (*b*) the difficulty in distinguishing whether classical Hebrew, 'new Hebrew,' or Aramaic, lie behind an Hellenistic Greek translation; (*c*) the possibility that an intimate acquaintance with the Septuagint and other literary compositions of Hellenistic Jews may be responsible for some of the Semiticisms of the author and for others his reproduction of the colloquial Semiticisms of Greek speaking companions whose native tongue was Aramaic; and (*d*) the probability that the author was himself bilingual and knew Greek and Hebrew, or tri-lingual and knew Aramaic also—like St. Paul.

If, however, the Gospel was written in Aramaic then two conclusions would seem to follow: (1) the First Epistle of St. John was also written

* *The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel*, by Prof. C. F. Burney; pub. Clarendon Press, Oxford; price 16/- net.

in Aramaic; and (2) both the Gospel and the Epistle were written in an for an Aramaic-speaking community, that is to say, for a communit either in Palestine or Syria. The historical arguments in favour of a Ephesian origin for both these documents seem much too weighty to b overthrown by the purely philological argument adduced with suc erudition and ingenuity by Professor Burney.

Dr. Burney's argument for the Antiochene origin of the Gospel i most interesting, but seems unconvincing. His conclusion that the earl external evidence for the authorship of the Gospel favours John th Disciple and Elder, but not the son of Zebedee, seems to have much mor to be said for it. The view that the Fourth Gospel, the three Epistles and the *Apocalypse* are all by the same author—written somewher between 75 A.D and 96 A.D.—would simplify matters for our traditionalists but there are too many difficulties in the way of acceptance, and not th least of these is the psychological. But whether Dr. Burney's critical con clusions be accepted or not, all who wish to understand the Fourth Gospe will be grateful to him for the light which his Semitic learning has throw upon the exegesis of a number of passages in it, and not least on VII 3 (pp. 109-111).

H.D.A.M.

PRIESTCRAFT AND POLITICS.[1]

'I believe in the Roman Church so far as it is Christian and Catholic I disbelieve in it so far as it is papal. I see two spirits in it, as i myself, struggling for supremacy—Light and Darkness; Christ an Anti-Christ; God and the Devil. At present Christ is thrown and Ant Christ is uppermost.'

So wrote George Tyrrell in 1908.[2] The words express the view, w imagine, of most unprejudiced persons who are in possession of the fac and have carefully considered them. On the one hand we have th Roman Church as, for example, Baron von Hügel sees her—the nurse 'deep spirituality and heroism,' which can still produce such personaliti as Father Damien, Jean Baptiste Vianney the peasant curé of Ar Eugénie Smet, and the Abbé Huvelin.[3] And on the other hand there

> 'A Church which depends for its strength and prestige on the iro discipline of a centralised autocracy, and on the fanatical devotio of soldiers who know no duty except obedience, no cause except th interests of their society.'[4]

The trouble seems to be that the Roman religion, so excellent *as* religion as it is, in certain countries, for certain stages of culture, a for persons of certain temperaments, cannot keep its fingers out politics. It may be perfectly true that religion, if it is to be vital a to have any effect upon the world, cannot remain utterly unconcerned wi politics.

> 'For everything in man hangs together; and Politics, whic adequately conceived, are so profoundly and widely importan cannot stand utterly outside Religion. Edmund Burke, de Tocqu ville, Ranke, did not think that they do. Economics certainly

[1] *The Roman Mischief-maker* (1920) and *Priestcraft* (1921) by Hugh E. M. Stutfie *National Review* Office. 7s. 6d. net each.

[2] *Autobiography and Life*, Vol. II, p. 413.

[3] *Eternal Life*, pp. 272 ff.

[4] Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, p. 197.

not; and can we draw any sharp line between Religion and Ethics, Ethics and Economics, Economics and Politics? Did Lorenzo de' Medici's intrigues against the Florentine Republic, or Marie Antoinette's successful determination to secure the dismissal of the ministers Turgot and Malesherbes, really have "nothing to do with religion"? I do not think we can maintain this.'[5]

Yet Theocracies, at any rate in modern times, have provoked more evils than they have remedied. For though we may accept the axiom that Religion and Politics cannot be dissociated, it does not follow as a corollary that the highly centralised administrative machinery of an international religious society can play any useful part in international affairs. At least not unless it works by entirely different methods and on an entirely different level to that on which secular governments operate; which it does not. If the level *is* different, it has usually been lower. As von Hügel again puts it:

> 'Any persistent and direct mixing up of politics and religion becomes intolerable in proportion to the limited number, to the unchecked power, and to the secrecy of procedure, of the religious officials thus operating.'[6]

The wisdom and authority of idealist Catholics like von Hügel are not likely to affect the policy of the Roman Curia, which was quite truly described by Tyrrell as 'incorrigible.' The vested interests of a sacerdotal oligarchy are easily victorious in a contest with persons whose primary motives and interests are ethical. Experience blows away any idealist illusions on this point. History does not teach that close corporations, especially those which are religious, are disposed to sacrifice what seem to be solid advantages for the empty satisfaction of justice or moderation. These things do not count, such coin is not current, at Rome.

Those Roman Catholics who are capable of reflection see clearly enough that the best hope for their Church lies in its decentralisation and depoliticalization. It might then become as an institution what many of its loyal children, both lay and clerical, are now as individuals—an agency of the Kingdom of God.

Mr. Stutfield in his two volumes may be said to have exhausted the language of invective; but, if that were all, his work would be innocuous. He has also collected an amount of discreditable material which will make educated Catholics who read his books, sigh for a different *régime* which would not force them to blush.

Mr. Stutfield's work is inspired by detestation of the Roman Church: we believe that an even more damaging book might be written by one who loves her. What Rome needs to-day is a Savonarola. But her policy strangles such children at their birth.

J.C.H.

[5] von Hugel, *Op. cit.*, p. 361. [6] *Op. cit.*, p. 362.

Footnote omitted from p. 54, April Number.

The Political Aspects of Saint Augustine's 'City of God,' by John Neville Figgis, Litt.D. Longmans. 7/6 net.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE ENIGMA OF MISSIONARY FAILURE.

SIR,

The following is a letter from a soldier to an Anglican Priest now working in the Mission Field in India:—

'In the face of our Lord's direct command to preach the Gospel in all the world, I admit that this is a very difficult question, but I think that missionary work in foreign parts lays itself open to honest criticism.

'I cannot agree with you that conversion to Christianity has, as a rule, made the native more honest, truthful, sober or moral. I think it has generally done the opposite. My opinion, after fifteen years in India and five in Africa, is that it has often made a good Hindu or Buddhist into a bad Christian. In this contention I am supported by the majority of my fellow countrymen who have lived in those parts. I think it might be better, presuming that missionary efforts continue on their present lines, if Hindus and Buddhists were left to their own religions and our energies devoted to the real heathen, such as cannibals and bushmen.

'You ask me if I think Peter and Paul would have agreed with me. This question appears to me somewhat anachronistic: I am quite aware that in A.D. 50, neither would have; but then, in A.D. 50, I should not have had reasons to hold the opinions I hold in A.D. 1922.

'In India, missionary bodies of all sects of Christianity have never succeeded in converting the "best people"—Brahmans and Rajputs—and have now, practically, given up trying. Most of the better classes go to Government schools, while the majority of students at mission schools are, with few exceptions, boys of the lower castes and aborigines. Unless the high castes and the influential natives are converted, India will never become Christianised. As it is at present with these castes and the better classes of Moslems unconverted, it means, for a solitary convert, utter ostracism from all he holds nearest and dearest in this life. We have begun our missionary work at the wrong end of society. Nowadays missionaries of all sects content themselves by converting the lowest classes of Hindus and Mahommedans and a few Chinese coolies. This, especially when you can offer them material advantages, as you admit you do, is not difficult. The results are not, however, always good.

'No, I cannot believe in that clause in the Athanasian Creed that damns everyone eternally unless he holds the "Catholic Faith" as laid down, *not* by our Lord, but, by wrangling bishops and priests in the fourth century. As regards man's future in the next life, I cannot believe that the Good God is going to divide good men and true into "sheep and goats" *because* of their religions. In the "Many Mansions" of our Father's Heaven there will be found room, I hope, for good men of all the Creeds that the Creator has permitted to evolve on this earth.

'You write that I, a Christian and holding strongly with the New Testament, in criticising modern missionary work among Mahommedans, Hindus and Buddhists, not only condemn St. Paul and all his works, but am "grossly inconsistent."

'Yes, IF the Gospel as preached to non-Christian people in all the world, by missionaries of the various sects of Christianity, is *really and truly* The Gospel that our Lord commanded us to preach *and nothing but that Gospel,* then, and then only, am I "grossly inconsistent."

'Something in my innermost heart tells me that in what I have just written lies the whole Enigma and perhaps the Solution of the Failure of our missionary work in foreign parts, aye, and at home too.

'Why is it that we Christians, after all these centuries, have utterly failed to bring the huge majority of mankind into the Christian Fold? I cannot but think that had the priests and ministers of Christendom really and truly preached the Gospel *as expounded by the Master in Galilee,* then, by the Grace of God and with the Faith that should move mountains, the whole world would have been brought to Christ centuries ago.

'Is the Faith, as preached by missionaries to Hindus, Buddhists, Mahommedans, Parsees, Confucians, Sikhs, Shintoists, and others, really and truly the same Faith as that preached by Jesus of Nazareth? Is God's help denied us in the mission field because we have greatly destroyed what Jesus preached by the addition of man-made dogmas unsupported by His Words?

'The Faith that Jesus preached was one of sublime perfection and kindness. Can Christendom honestly say that the cruelties practised by Christian Powers and priests to enforce a parody of Christ's Faith upon, for example, the Mexicans and Peruvians in the sixteenth century, were, in any way, according to the Gospel of "Jesu, Gentlest Saviour" or an "Imitation of Christ"? The same may be said of thousands of forced "conversions" by the, so-called, "Holy Office" and missionaries in mediaeval times and in a minor degree of many modern "conversions."

'Can Christendom say, even nowadays, that the antagonistic, and, at times, warring forces of the Church of England, the Roman Church, the Presbyterians, the Lutherans, the Baptists, the Wesleyans, the Methodists and many other cults are preaching the one and only Gospel that our Lord commanded them to preach *and nothing but that Gospel.* Our Lord preached Peace and Goodwill to all mankind, not inter-missionary feuds and bickerings over trifles and dogma unknown in A.D. 30. How can "the poor heathen" understand, for example, such un-Christian-like wranglings and bitterness that took place over the Kikuyu affair just before the Great War? Jesus Christ preached one Faith and one only. "The hundred warring sects of Christendom" preach many different Faiths.

'You hurl at my head St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Boomerang-like it now returns to you with this message: "There be some that trouble you and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

'You ask me "What has Buddha and his faith to do with Jesus?" I will tell you. There is more kinship between the character and acts of Jesus of Nazareth and those of Siddatha Gautama of the Ganges Valley; there is more similitude between "The Sermon on the Mount" and "The Eight-fold Aryan Path" than there is between the many creeds and dogmas of Christendom and the simple Gospel as told us by Jesus. Both Christianity and Buddhism have been, by man, sadly degraded from their original purity. One may, with truth, say that there is now more similitude between the Great Temple at Llassa, with its Dalai Lama, its abbot and priests, its dalmatics, copes, incense and praying wheels, and the ritual and practices of, say, St. Peter's at Rome, than there is between either modern Buddhism and its Founder's Faith or modern Christianity and its Founder's Faith.

'May it not be that God does not *will* that this much-corrupted Gospel of Jesus should be made a stumbling-block to the thousand million non-Christian peoples of the world? May it not be that His purpose is that

before we are allowed by Him to preach the Gospel in all the world, the so-called Churches of Christ must first of all revert to the simple Gospel as preached by Jesus and discard the theological puzzles and enormities invented by popes, bishops, priests and ministers during seventeen or eighteen centuries.

'Compare the progress of Christianity during the first few years when it was preached by the Apostles to the progress during eighteen centuries when it was preached by their successors. Does not this point to the lesson I am trying to drive home?'

'As a Soldier and a Layman I now put to you, a priest of the Holy Church, two questions. Tell me, honestly, can you give any other answers than those I give?

'Is it possible that our Lord, after His promises of help and hope to His followers, would not have assisted His missioners in the work He gave them to do, provided they were doing that work and no other?

'It is not possible. It is unthinkable.

'Is it possible that *with* that Divine Help, if we had really worked on the lines He laid down, our endeavours to convert the whole world to Him and Him only would have been such a tragic failure?

'It is not possible. It is unthinkable.'

F. C. CARTER, C.B.,
Brigadier-General.

[It is a mistake to think of the clergy as being always the inventors of those things that have corrupted the Gospel. In a number of cases the corruptions have come from other systems, and have been acquiesced in rather than invented by the clergy.—ED., M.C.]

MODERN CHURCHMEN AND THE MISSION FIELD.

SIR,

As my own special work lies in the Foreign Field, I am not in touch with the young men who might be expected to come forward for ordination in this country, but my memories of my own youth lead me to think that needless obstacles are put in the way. When I was in my first curacy I read a report of a sermon preached by the then Bishop of Shrewsbury before the University of Cambridge, in which he charged men with fearing to take Orders because they did not like a life of poverty, and I wrote a letter to the *Cambridge Review*, which was printed, pointing out that in my opinion poverty was by no means the only deterrent, and that men shrunk from taking Orders because of the doctrinal tests.

A year or two ago I was reading a book by Dr. Arthur Neve, the well-known Medical Missionary of Kashmir, in which he suggested as a creed for the Church of India 'I believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, my Saviour.' Those, I think, were the words, and he said they were the declaration in use in the Student Christian Movement.

I myself, when a theological student, put off ordination for a year on account of difficulties in the Prayer Book. The things that bothered me then were: (1) The declaration of believing all the Canonical Scriptures; (2) The minatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed; (3) A subsidiary difficulty either then or at a rather later time was the questions to sponsors in the Baptism Service.

Indeed, at one time I thought I never should be ordained, and even applied for a classical lectureship which was vacant in Adelaide, Australia. If I had got it, I very likely never should have been ordained. Many years afterwards I read in the *Life of Pilkington of Uganda* that he was another of the disappointed candidates for that same lectureship, and for reasons similar to mine, difficulties of conscience which had nothing to do with the fundamental doctrines of the faith. I notice that, though Pilkington was accepted by the C.M.S., and translated the Bible into Luganda, he was never ordained.

Dr. Westcott told me that the declaration about believing the Canonical Scriptures need mean no more than that I accepted them as the books appointed by authority to be read in Church, and I made the declaration in that sense, but it does not seem to me to be the natural sense of the words. Bishop Moorhouse told me that, though he did not scruple to say the Athanasian Creed himself, he was willing to ordain me in spite of my scruples, and so I have never said the Athanasian Creed from that day to this.

Nor are these the only stumbling-blocks which I have found in the Prayer Book. How much better it would be if we could trust the young Christian men of our day with larger freedom in the ministry!

It seems to me that we are on the eve of another Reformation. We have been putting new wine into old bottles too long. Protestantism substituted an infallible Bible for an infallible Church. The infallibility of the Bible is as much lost at the beginning of the twentieth century as that of the Church was at the beginning of the sixteenth. The problem before the theologians is to find that which shall take its place.

CAMBRIDGE GRADUATE.

THE *MEMORIAL D'HISTOIRE RELIGIEUSE.*

SIR,

Readers of the *Modern Churchman* who are interested in the religious conditions of the Continent, and in particular of France, may be glad to know of the recently founded *Mémorial d'Histoire Religieuse,* published monthly by the *Société d'histoire et de Littérature Ecclésiastiques.* This publication, though small, is of exceptional literary and historical quality; it is Catholic, though not clerical; and is written from an independent point of view.

The price of a single number is 60 centimes; the yearly subscription, outside France, 10 francs, which may be paid by cheque or money order to the Secretariat, 12 Rue Rodier, Paris (9).

ALFRED FAWKES.

ASHBY ST. LEDGERS,
April 7th, 1922.

THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH'S CHARGE.

SIR,

In justice to the Bishop of Edinburgh we would ask you to qualify or even withdraw a paragraph of criticism in the March number, which described him as influenced by the Duke of Argyll and his party, and went on to make an ill-informed comment on the relation of the Celtic Church to its chiefs.

We deplore as much as you do the Bishop's Charge, but we feel bound to point out that the Duke of Argyll and his party held a meeting in Edinburgh at about the same time as the meeting of Synod, and that the Bishop declined an invitation to preside at it.

A glance at the Constitution of the Episcopal Church in Scotland ought to correct any ideas about the influence of hereditary chiefs. The strength and backbone of the Church is now in the middle class congregations of the big towns, and the sneering description of a former age which described episcopal churches as 'places where much needed prayer was offered for county families' is now happily obsolete.

You will forgive us if we say that, while we agreed with the main criticisms you made, we thought the paragraph we have commented on scarcely up to the standard of fairness and courtesy that we are accustomed to expect from the *Modern Churchman*.

JOHN H. WATT, Rector, Church of the Good Shepherd, Murrayfield.
ERNEST F. MORISON, Incumbent of Rosslyn Chapel, Roslin, Midlothian.

[In deference to the knowledge possessed by our correspondents, we are glad to withdraw the statement: 'We are inclined to believe that pressure exerted by the Duke of Argyll and the Scottish members of the E.C.U. is really responsible for the Bishop of Edinburgh's action.' The Bishop in his Charge stated that his action was the result of his receiving a deputation begging him to make a public pronouncement about the Girton Conference, and we connected this with the E.C.U. agitation in Scotland, then being fomented by the Duke of Argyll. The statement: 'Celtic Christianity has always shown a tendency to make its bishops subservient to its chiefs,' appears to us to be borne out by what we know of Irish and Welsh history, but we are glad to learn that it is not true to-day of the Scottish Episcopal Church.—ED., *M.C.*]

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NOTICES

The Annual Gathering of the Churchmen's Union will take place on Friday, June 16, in London. The CORPORATE COMMUNION will be celebrated at St. Andrew's Church, Ashley Place, Victoria Street, S.W. (by kind permission of the Vicar, the Rev. E. St. G. Schomberg), at 11.30 a.m. Preacher: The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

The BUSINESS MEETING will be held at 3 p.m. at the Church House, Westminster, in the Hoare Memorial Hall (Great Smith Street entrance), when, after the transaction of the ordinary business, the following resolution will be proposed by the Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., and seconded by Mr. H. F. WALKER:

> 'That this meeting is grateful to the Upper Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York for the measure of sympathy and protection which they have accorded to men who are trying to interpret Christian doctrine in terms of modern thought.'

The PUBLIC MEETING will be held in the same Hall at 8 p.m. Prof. P. GARDNER, D.Litt., F.B.A. (President of the Churchmen's Union), will preside, and the speakers will be the VERY REV. THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S, SIR JOHN BARRAN, Bt., MR. CLAUD MULLINS, REV. H. R. L. SHEPPARD.